THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

TAKING his cue from Basic English, Dr. H. D. A. MAJOR, the Editor of 'The Modern Churchman,' has written a challenging book on *Basic Christianity: The World Religion*.[1] Basic English is 'a great simplification of the English language undertaken for the purpose of making that language the language of mankind. Of the 250,000 words in the Oxford Dictionary less than one thousand have been selected to express in sentences of the simplest grammatical structure the vast majority of human experiences, needs, achievements, intentions, and values.'

That expresses clearly Dr. MAJOR'S object in dealing with religion. The operative words are 'simplification' and 'selection.' Dr. MAJOR feels deeply the need of a vital religion for our time. But, to be effective it must be a universal religion. How are we to reach such a world-wide faith? It can only be by the method of selection, and the writer passes in review (as Jesse did with his sons before Samuel) the various religions, and eliminates them all except Christianity. Hinduism, Buddhism, Islam, Judaism, Confucianism—none of them is fitted to be the universal religion. Only Christianity has this promise and potency.

But not traditional Christianity, not dogmatic Christianity, not Papal Christianity, not even Reformed Christianity. The selective method unerringly chooses Christianity, but only after it is simplified can it be fitted for a world-wide rôle. Only Basic Christianity can meet the world's need to-day. But what is Basic Christianity? To find that we must return to the Founder and ask: What was the religion of Jesus Himself? That is a question not so easy to answer as it seems, because of the different strata in the Gospels.

In spite of this difficulty, however, we can reach the fundamental idea in the teaching of Jesus. It was the Kingdom of God—'the world of invisible laws by which God is ruling and blessing His creatures,' as Dr. Hort defines it. About this Dr. MAJOR asks four questions, the answers to which pretty much sum up his Basic Christianity and his own idea of a universal religion. First, who is the King of the Kingdom? The answer is 'God'; and, arising out of that answer, 'What is He like?' the answer of Jesus is, 'He is a divine Father.'

The second question is: Who are the subjects of the Kingdom? The answer is: Potentially the whole human race, actually those who are striving to realize in their character and conduct the ideal of divine sonship which is found in the Beatitudes. The third question is: What are the duties of the sons of the Kingdom? The answer is found in the two great Commandments. The fourth question is: What is the Faith of the sons of the Kingdom? In what creed is it expressed? Where is this creed to be found? The answer is, briefly, in the Lord's Prayer.

This is Basic Christianity, and this is the religion which is fitted to be a universal religion. It is simple. It is profound enough to meet man's deepest needs. It is practicable enough to contribute a solution to all man's personal, social, and international problems. There is one point, however, of special importance which needs to be clarified: What is the position of Jesus in the Kingdom? Did He present Himself as the King of the Kingdom whose divine and regal authority must be accepted as a preliminary by every one who would become a member of the Kingdom?

There are two answers to that. One is that of Jesus Himself; the other that of the Christian Church. It should be noted (and 'we cannot be too clear on this point') the problem is not: Was Jesus the Son of God? (we probably imagined this *was* the problem, but Dr. MAJOR insists that we were wrong). The problem is: Whether Jesus Himself taught that this must be accepted and professed by every one as an absolutely necessary preliminary for entry into the Kingdom of God.

Most Christian authorities say that Jesus did lay down this condition, but Dr. MAJOR thinks not. He only demanded the acceptance of His

[1] Blackwell; 3s. 6d. net.

gospel of the Kingdom as it has been presented in the answers to the four questions already given. Jesus was deeply concerned about the acceptance of that gospel in the practical form of obedience to it, but, provided men obeyed, 'He cared nothing for their professions of belief in Him as the Son of God. . . . Men entered the Kingdom by their faith in what He taught as God's good news to men.'

Dr. MAJOR anticipates certain objections to this Basic Christianity. Such as these: (1) Will not this reduce Jesus Himself to insignificance? Emphatically, No. It should lead us back to Him, to 'all that is most essential, universal, and practical in His teaching and example.' Of course we cannot be bound to a static loyalty. 'Our modern needs, our modern knowledge, our modern outlook, all demand that in some respects we should advance beyond the Jesus of history.' Our true loyalty entails unflinching devotion to His principles, but not necessarily a literal obedience to His precepts.

---

(2) A second objection is: Will this Basic Christianity not lead us away from Catholic theology and especially from the Christ of Catholic theology? The answer is that the essential truth in Catholic theology will be expressed by adherents of Basic Christianity in their own terms. In Basic Christianity the Jesus of history will, for practical purposes, replace the Christ of Catholic dogma.

Passing over the assurance that Basic Christianity will not destroy the Church but will transform it, we come to a critical objection: Will it not deprive the Church of its august authority and the Church's venerable Ministry, Sacraments and Rites of their reverent estimation? The answer is 'Yes' and 'No.' No, if the Church is prepared to be the servant of the Kingdom. In a historically comprehensible way the Church has come to identify itself with the Kingdom. The servant has replaced the master, and it is high time to terminate the Church's usurpation of the 'Crown Rights' of the Kingdom. Unless this is done the Church will lose what power and authority it still has. The Church's future depends on whether it is going to be the leaven of the Kingdom of God or the lump of ecclesiastical tradition.

Finally: How is Basic Christianity to be implemented? By the Church? Dr. MAJOR has a slender hope of this because his appreciation of the Church is very slender indeed. As a matter of fact he thinks the Church has been changing for the worse. A generation ago it was stronger, less factious, more influential, more liberal. The neo-Calvinism of Barth and the lure of Rome have been among influences that have caused the deterioration. It may be necessary to contemplate the scrapping of the Church and the institution of another organization, a Fellowship of the Kingdom; and the closing pages of this book are devoted to a sketch of this communion, whose creed would be the Lord's Prayer, its ethic the two great Commandments, and its membership open to men of all religions and none.

This book is in the nature of a manifesto by a representative 'modern churchman.' It is a challenge to orthodoxy. It is also an appeal to the 'outsider' to come in and accept a simplified Christianity which is capable of being the wanted universal religion, one that will make room for a Buddhist or an adherent of Islam. Not all, even of modern churchmen, will accept its conclusions. But the book will certainly be read.

The Inspiration of God,[1] by Canon Roger LLOYD of Winchester, sets forth the belief that God, in response to prayer, may bestow His special grace of inspiration, but that there are certain clear conditions governing the reception of it. We must first believe that divine inspiration is there to be received, and we must then create for ourselves the mould in which it can best be given and received.

What is that mould? It is the basic affirmation of this book that inspiration is a function of community, and can only be rightly exercised from within community. If then we are to be receptive of inspiration, we must become members of consecrated communities. Thereafter we can but wait in patience upon God. The Bible knows nothing of the inspiration of solitude.

Our author acknowledges his indebtedness for this way of looking at the matter to Mr. T. S. Eliot's book on 'The Idea of a Christian Society.' There the Church's task is conceived as threefold. 'It must shepherd individuals and families, and this it does mainly through the parochial system by the action of the community of the parish church. It must plant small communities in the modern institutions and groupings of society, and these again must be drawn from the parochial communities. It must acknowledge that it has a mission to the whole nation in its communal

[1] Centenary Press; 5s. net.

totality, which, of course, it can discharge only as it brings to bear its own full community upon the nation.'

What are the normal ways in which the inspiration of God comes to individuals as members of consecrated communities? Sometimes through the instrument of direct and simple talk (Moses, St. Teresa of Avila, Joan of Arc). Sometimes through dreams (St. Peter, Cornelius). Sometimes by direct revelation (Isaiah, Ezekiel, St. Paul). And what are the tests of genuine inspiration? There is a shrinking either from the manner of its being given or from the task to which it points; there follows an enrichment through it of religious experience; and there is the further practical test, that of its fruits.

At the close of his book our author examines the inspiration of the artist, comparing it with divine inspiration in that context of specifically religious actions and responses with which he has been till then concerned. The question he asks us to consider is, 'Do the principles and conditions of divine inspiration, disclosed so far in the religious sphere alone, apply also, and in the same degree, in the sphere of art?'

Artistic inspiration is held to be a gift of God, though artists themselves may not acknowledge this. 'If the breath of God is in their works it does not follow that they recognize the source from which their consciousness of inspiration comes. Shakespeare's hold upon Christian doctrine was sketchy, Keats seems to have been a pantheist. Hardy definitely repudiated the Christian way of life. A. E. Housman was practically an atheist. But if inspiration in art exists at all, all these emphatically experienced it.'

As for the Biblical principle that to know the inspired life it is necessary to dwell in true community, does it also hold if in a different way of artistic inspiration? 'A symphony is something which you go away by yourself into solitariness to create. But the impulse to create it, and the discipline to keep at it until it is perfectly completed seems to be the product . . . of belonging to the appropriate social *milieu*,' as may be illustrated from the biography of Brahms. Similarly, Shakespeare required for creative work the setting of the Mermaid and the Elizabethan poets and wits, and Wordsworth the setting of Cambridge, 'the greatest nursery of English poetry.'

It is then our author's contention that in matters of art, as in matters of faith, inspiration comes through membership of a community already inspired. This is the sacramental principle. 'The fire is of God and He kindles it. But we catch this fire from the men and women who are themselves alight.'

The Use and Disposal of the Marcan Source in Luke's Passion Narrative.

By the Reverend Professor Allan Barr, M.A., United Free Church of Scotland College, Edinburgh.

In the discussion of the Proto-Luke hypothesis in The Expository Times (Vol. LIV., Nos. 7 and 8) the Rev. C. S. Petrie and Dr. Vincent Taylor dealt chiefly with the relation of Luke to Mark in the part of the Gospels which precedes the narrative of the Passion. It is indeed necessary that that field should be thoroughly explored. But it is an essential part of the Proto-Luke hypothesis that Luke uses and in the main prefers to Mark a Passion Narrative already incorporated in Proto-Luke; and it is necessary not only for the elucidation of this particular hypothesis but for an understanding of the Third Gospel on any view of its composition that every effort should be made to bring the ascertainable facts regarding Luke's use of Mark in the earlier portions of his Gospel to bear upon the special and difficult critical problems of the Passion Narrative. Among the outstanding facts which require an explanation are the decline in the degree of verbal correspondence with Mark from Lk 22^{14} onwards and certain deviations from Mark's order in Luke's account of the Passion. Streeter,[1] following Hawkins, gives the average percentage of verbal correspondence with Mark in the other parts of Luke as 53, while in the Passion Narrative (in those passages which have affinities with Mark)

[1] *The Four Gospels*, 202.

the figure drops to 27; and Hawkins[1] notes twelve transpositions or inversions of order in a famous list. Unless these facts are adequately explained on other grounds, there will always be room for hypotheses like that of Proto-Luke which posit another Passion Narrative preferred by Luke to Mark; and it is incumbent upon those who are not satisfied by such hypotheses to offer, if possible, a better explanation. It is the purpose of the present article to state certain generalizations drawn from Luke's use of Mark in the earlier parts of the Gospel, which, when applied to the Passion Narrative, seem to throw some light on this complicated question. They belong to the limited field of form, and they are five in number. The first three deal with verbal correspondence, the other two with the order of Marcan material in Luke.

The three generalizations about to be stated depend upon a distinction between the narration of actions or events and the record of sayings. The portions of Luke clearly based upon Mark (4^{31}–6^{19} 8^{4}–9^{50} 18^{15}–22^{13}, less a few non-Marcan sections) fall naturally into sections, varying from 2 to 17 verses in length, each with a unity of its own as well as its place in the general scheme of the Gospel. Nearly all of these contain a proportion of sayings, some of them pronouncements of Jesus which provide the chief interest of the sections, some of them remarkable words addressed to Jesus or by Jesus to others in close connexion with the working of miracles, and some which are no more than a graphic means of furthering the course of the narrative. The rest forms the narrative setting.

(1) In Marcan sections the degree of verbal correspondence tends to decline in Luke's narration of action and event, as distinguished from the record of sayings. While remaining dependent upon Mark as a source, Luke inclines to make the whole narrative setting his own. In particular, he practically re-writes the introductions (conjunctions and other words of connexion, and notices of time, place, and circumstance) to the Marcan sections, and he frequently rounds off a section with a concluding comment which is either absent from Mark or differently phrased by him.

(2) Conversely, the degree of verbal correspondence tends to rise in Luke's record of sayings, particularly of those which are striking and memorable. The sayings of Jesus, whether in discourse or embedded in narrative, form in many of the Marcan sections the core of the tradition and on the whole are resistant to change. Words addressed to Jesus by others share to some extent in this tendency.

[1] In *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, 78–84.

(3) Brief sections of a predominantly narrative character tend to show a very low rate of verbal correspondence with Mark. On merely statistical grounds one would expect the shorter sections to show the greater variation from the mean, and on both sides of it, while longer sections would tend to approximate to the average. But the tendency of Luke to supply the connecting and introductory words has the effect in many cases of greatly reducing the verbal correspondence in brief narrative sections, as such words are there liable to form a considerable proportion of the whole.

It must be emphasized that these are generalizations, which admit of exceptions, and that they refer to tendencies, not rules. It would be ridiculous to suggest that Luke wrote with an eye on his percentages. But they are open to confirmation or refutation by a study of the details of the Marcan sections of Luke. The limitations of space make it impossible here to give a full presentation of the facts, but the following instances are representative. It should be kept in mind that the general proportion of Marcan words in these sections of Luke is just over half (53 per cent.).

(*a*) Sections of Luke predominantly narrative, showing a low rate of verbal correspondence with Mark:[2]

	Per cent.
$4^{40.\,41}$. (Healings at Sunset)	37
4^{42-44}. (Withdrawal of Jesus)	39
6^{12-16}. (Choice of the Twelve)	45[3]
6^{17-19}. (Healing of Multitudes)	34[3]
9^{28-36}. (The Transfiguration)	37
9^{43b-45}. (Prediction of the Passion)	37
19^{37-40}. (The Approach to Jerusalem)	11
$19^{47.\,48}$. (Teaching in the Temple)	28

The percentage would be still lower in some of these examples but for the presence of sayings close to Mark. 4^{42-44}, however, includes a saying which departs from Mark. Several of them are

[2] Unless otherwise stated I use throughout the figures (to the nearest whole number) and in general I follow the section-divisions, given by Dr. Taylor in his thorough investigation of verbal correspondence in *Behind the Third Gospel*, chs. ii.–iv. It should be observed that the figures indicate the proportion of Luke's words found also in Mark to the whole section *of Luke*. Thus Luke's omissions and compressions of Mark are not reflected in the figures, while his additions are. The proportion of the same words to the total *in Mark* would be different in most cases.

[3] The question raised by Mr. Petrie and Dr. Taylor as to the relation of these sections to Luke's Sermon on the Plain and also to Matthew's Sermon on the Mount is of great interest. In view of the position of the sections in relation to the preceding Marcan block and of the closer correspondence of Lk 6^{17-19} than of Mt 4^{24-25} to Mk 3^{7-12} I have treated the sections as substantially Marcan.

very brief sections illustrating the third tendency stated above.

(*b*) Sections including a large proportion of sayings and showing a high rate of verbal correspondence with Mark. Most of these culminate in a pronouncement by Jesus :

	Per cent.
5^{27-32}. (The Call of Levi) . . .	63
5^{33-35}. (On Fasting) . . .	74
6^{1-5}. (Cornfields on Sabbath) . .	77
9^{18-22}. (Peter's Confession) . .	66
9^{23-27}. (Taking up the Cross) . .	84 [1]
9^{49-50}. (A Stranger Working Miracles) .	73
18^{15-17}. (Blessing of Children) . .	87
20^{41-44}. (David's Son) . . .	74 [1]
20^{45-47}. (Condemnation of the Scribes) .	79 [1]

(*c*) The majority of the sections contain sayings embedded in narrative and show approximately average correspondence with Mark. Many of these are miracle-stories. Examples are : Lk 4^{31-37}, 63 per cent. ; 5^{12-16}, 51 per cent. ; 5^{17-26}, 45 per cent. ; 6^{6-11}, 43 per cent. ; 8^{22-25}, 50 per cent. ; 8^{40-56}, 50 per cent. ; 9^{37-43a}, 40 per cent. ; 9^{46-48}, 50 per cent. ; 18^{35-43}, 55 per cent. ; 20^{20-26}, 57 per cent. ; 21^{1-4}, 67 per cent. The interest of such sections for our present purpose is that when analysed into narrative and sayings material they generally illustrate in a striking way the tendencies under discussion. Four sections may be given as examples, with separate percentages for Marcan correspondence : (1) in the sections generally ; (2) in narrative ; (3) in sayings : [2]

	(1)	(2)	(3)
5^{12-16}. (Cure of a Leper) . .	51	33	89
6^{6-11}. (Synagogue Healing) .	43	32	75
20^{20-26}. (Tribute to Cæsar) . .	57	35	78
21^{1-4}. (The Widow's Offering) .	67	43	85

(*d*) The influence of these tendencies can also be seen when groups or blocks of Marcan sections are compared. Groups like Lk 4^{31-44} and 8^{22}–9^{17} (each showing 52 per cent. of verbal correspondence with Mark) have a good proportion both of narrative and sayings, several of the component sections being miracle-stories. Where, however, a group of sections is predominantly didactic (as the parables and other teaching of 8^{4-21}) or is rich in sayings (as 18^{15-43}) the rate of correspondence tends to rise (59 per cent. and 68 per cent. in these cases). It is of particular interest to observe that the account of the last days in Jerusalem, 20^{1}–21^{4}, which has the high correspondence rate of 62 per cent., consists mainly of a series of pronouncements by Jesus on such questions as Authority, Tribute, the Resurrection, the Son of David ; also that the section 22^{7-13} (Preparations for the Last Supper) has the high correspondence rate of 65 per cent. because of Marcan sayings-material. The fact that these sections contrast so sharply in respect of Marcan correspondence with the following Passion Narrative is one of the outstanding features of the whole problem, but the distinction between sayings-interest and narrative-interest seems, to some extent at least, to relieve the contrast.

We come now to questions of order and arrangement. In general, where it is clear that Luke is using Mark as his only source, he adheres closely to his order. But where other sources offer an alternative to Mark or are combined with Mark more complicated arrangements result. These tendencies are summed up in the two following statements.

(4) Where Luke prefers an alternative to a Marcan passage he regularly places it in a different context. This is a remarkable feature of the Third Gospel, which is now generally recognized.[3] It is found in the following sections and a few other brief passages : The Call of the First Disciples (Mk 1^{16-20}, Lk 5^{1-11}), The Beelzebub Question (Mk 3^{22-30}, Lk 11^{14-23}), The Mustard Seed (Mk 4^{30-32}, Lk $13^{18.19}$), The Rejection at Nazareth (Mk 6^{1-6}, Lk 4^{16-30}), The Great Commandment (Mk 12^{28-34}, Lk 10^{25-28}), The Anointing (Mk 14^{3-9}, Lk 7^{36-50}). In some cases the alternative is in an earlier position than the corresponding section of Mark, in others in a later. More than one explanation of this feature of Luke's methods may be suggested. It is used as an argument in favour of the Proto-Luke hypothesis, but it is not claimed that by itself it proves that Luke regularly preferred non-Marcan sources to Marcan. There are cases of alternatives where Luke retains both, as in the Mission of the Twelve and of the Seventy (9^{1-6} 10^{1-12}), the Condemnation of the Scribes and of the Pharisees and Lawyers (20^{45-47} 11^{37-52}). And we have no means of recognizing examples of the opposite preference—Marcan to non-Marcan—as Luke's non-Marcan sources are known to us only by what he uses of them. The Proto-Luke hypothesis itself depends upon the assumption of such a preference in the important sections leading up to the Last Supper.[4]

(5) In uniting (we avoid the question-begging word 'insertion') Marcan with non-Marcan material Luke regularly allows considerable modification and dislocation of Mark around the point of juncture. The following table indicates in condensed form the principal non-Marcan passages

[1] Introduced by four, four, and eight non-Marcan words respectively.

[2] My own estimate in (2) and (3).

[3] Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, 209 f.

[4] Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel*, 34 f., 98 f.

and modifications of Mark in the adjacent Marcan sections :

Lk 4^{16-30}.	Mk 1^{16-20} omitted in favour of Lk 5^{1-11}.[1]
Lk 6^{20}–8^{3}.	Mk $3^{7-12.\ 13-19}$ transposed.
	Mk 3^{22-30} omitted in favour of Lk 11^{14-23}.
	Mk 3^{31-35} postponed to Lk 8^{19-21}.
Lk 9^{51}–18^{14}.	Mk 9^{42}–10^{12} omitted (but cf. Lk 17^{2}, 14^{34}, 16^{18}).
Lk 19^{1-27}.	Mk 10^{46}. Contrast Lk 18^{35}.
Lk 19^{41-44}.	Mk $11^{12-14,\ 20-25}$ omitted.
	Mount of Olives, Lk 19^{37}.
Lk 21^{34-36}.	Mk 13^{33-37} displaced (but cf. Lk 19^{12-13}, 12^{38-40}).

It will be seen that some of the most notable deviations of Luke from Mark are here involved.

Do these considerations throw any light on Luke's Passion Narrative ? From the point of view of form this part of the Gospel has evidently characteristics of its own. It is one continuous story which progresses by the narration of a chain of numerous events, the elements of the narrative sometimes occupying only a few verses, a single verse, or even less.[2] Where the units are small it becomes more difficult to decide where Luke is using Mark and where not, and so to make an objective assessment of verbal correspondence (actual estimates do differ greatly).[3] On any method of counting, however, the general verbal correspondence with Mark is lower than in the earlier parts of the Gospel. But our first three generalizations, drawn from that earlier material, may in some measure account for this difference. The Passion Story, after the Last Supper, is essentially narrative. It contains a good number of sayings, many of which are used by Luke. But the kind of saying, rich in didactic content, which accounts in so many earlier sections for the high rate of verbal correspondence, has now been left behind, and the interest is centred on the events of the Passion, so significant, as events, for the Christian writer and his readers. The narrative, too, consists of small units briefly recording successive happenings ; it is not inconsistent, as we have seen, with Luke's practice elsewhere for changes of Mark's connexion, order and description to be found in such passages, with consequent wide verbal divergence from Mark. It is highly significant that in the account of Peter's denials, where we have a larger unit, and the interest is turned upon the spoken words, we have a return to the average rate of correspondence with Mark (50 per cent.). These considerations, however, have to be taken in conjunction with those which follow.

When the order and transpositions of Marcan material in the Passion Narrative are regarded in the light of the fourth and fifth of our generalizations, two divergent hypotheses seem to be suggested. If, on the one hand, the tendency of Luke to substitute for omitted Marcan passages other similar material in another context is here exemplified, we may have an explanation both of the presence of elements remotely parallel to Mark and of their order, with the possibility that they are derived from another continuous Passion Narrative. If, on the other hand, the tendency for the dislocation of the Marcan source at its juncture with non-Marcan material accords better with the facts before us, then Mark appears as the framework of Luke's Passion Narrative, and the rest of the material as insertions. Now, the validity of the first hypothesis is not easy to test, for with the smaller scale of the Passion Narrative and the natural relation of event to event there is not room for sweeping alterations of order, such as are found in earlier passages.[4] The main outlines of Mark are undisturbed. The changes appear in minor matters, the timing and relative order of adjacent events. But it is noteworthy that some of the passages which appear to have been transposed are among those which are admitted to be Marcan.[5] And all depends upon that discrimination between Marcan and non-Marcan material, which lies at the end and not the beginning of our inquiry.

The other hypothesis, however, which deals with the effect of the introduction of clearly non-Marcan material, can be more effectively tested. We assume that Luke has before him Mark and certain additional material descriptive of the last events at Jerusalem, and that he works the latter into the Marcan scheme ; and we inquire whether these assumptions lead to a reasonable explanation

[1] I regard Lk $4^{14.\ 15}$ as founded on Mk $1^{14.\ 15}$, and Luke's departure from the Marcan wording as an example of the principle under discussion. In any case the displacement of Mk 1^{16-20} occurs at this point.

[2] *E.g.* Lk $23^{26,\ 34b,\ 46.\ 47}$.

[3] Many students, however, will not be satisfied with the results of Streeter's and Dr. Taylor's investigations, which distinguish as Marcan a few scattered verses inserted into a non-Marcan source. It seems to be carrying analysis to excess, *e.g.*, in Lk 22 to attribute *v.*[22] to Mark and not *vv.*[21-23], *v.*[34] and not *v.*[33], *v.*[50b] and not *vv.*[49.\ 50a] ; or, if any part of 22^{40-46} or 23^{18-25} is admitted to be Marcan, to confine the dependence to one or two fragments. See Streeter, *op. cit.*, 222, Taylor, *op. cit.*, 128.

[4] The principle of compensation for Marcan omissions may perhaps be traced in the Gethsemane section ($22^{43.\ 44}$, if admitted to the text, corresponding to Mk $14^{33.\ 34}$), the Mocking at Herod's Court (23^{11}, cf. Mk 15^{16-20}), the Last Words of Jesus (23^{46}, cf. Mk 15^{34}). Similarly, in an earlier passage (the Transfiguration) the addition of $9^{31.\ 32}$ coincides with the omission of Mk 9^{9-13}.

[5] *E.g.*, Peter's Denials and the Superscription on the Cross.

of the special features of Luke's Passion Narrative. (*a*) In narrating the Last Supper Luke adds certain words of Jesus stressing the eschatological significance of the Supper ($22^{15.16}$). With this change, the Marcan verse, 'I will not drink from henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God shall come,' is transferred from after the breaking of the bread to a position before it, and (in the shorter text) the drinking of the cup precedes the breaking of the bread.[1] (*b*) To the narrative of the Supper Luke further adds an account of a dispute among the disciples about greatness and Jesus' lesson on humility, followed, in a natural order, by words addressed to Peter regarding his faith and words addressed to all the disciples in view of their coming ordeal (22^{24-38}). Associated with these additions we find changes from the Marcan order to which Luke may have been led simply by a sense of literary fitness. The disciples' question, 'Is it I?' which in Mark appears at the beginning of the Supper is transferred to a position after it, where, in an altered form, it provides an appropriate transition to the dispute about greatness. With it are necessarily brought the prediction of betrayal and the woe on the betrayer, also with some verbal change (22^{21-23}). Similarly, the prediction of Peter's denials is brought up beside the other words addressed to him (22^{33-34}) instead of being uttered, as in Mark, on the way to Gethsemane. The verses which follow ($22^{39ff.}$) are naturally affected by these changes. (*c*) At the high priest's house Mark narrates a trial of Jesus before 'the high priests and the whole sanhedrin' at dead of night, followed by insults paid by some of those present to Jesus, and then by Peter's denials. Whether because of information of his own, or from sound historical insight, Luke postpones the trial till morning, while retaining Peter's denials and the insulting of Jesus in their natural Marcan setting as events of the night (22^{54-71}). But the bond of Marcan order—Trial, Insulting, Denials—is now broken, and Luke is free to bring the Denials (before the Insulting) to a fitting place indicated by Mark himself (14^{54}). (*d*) The additional section on the trial before Herod (23^{4-16}) is associated with changes in the preceding section (Jesus Accused before Pilate) and omissions in the next (Condemnation by Pilate) and may be connected with the omission of the Mocking by Pilate's Soldiers which follows in Mark. (*e*) The introduction of the words to the women of Jerusalem does not seem to give rise to any considerable change except that part of Mk 15^{27} is brought up to form the closing verse of the section (23^{32}). (*f*) In the account of the Crucifixion, the insertion of the words, 'Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do' and of the section on the two thieves is also associated with minor changes of order (23^{33-43}). (*g*) At the death of Jesus the final cry is made articulate in the words, 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.' With this addition, and the omission of the Marcan cry of dereliction, the words referring to the rending of the temple veil are transferred to an earlier position beside Mark's reference to the darkness (23^{44-46}). (*h*) The approaching non-Marcan narrative of the Resurrection appearances at Jerusalem may account for certain additions and alterations to Mark in the narrative of the Burial and the Empty Tomb (23^{50}–24^{12}).

It will be seen that all the important deviations from Marcan order are included in this hypothetical survey. On the ground of a tendency observed in Luke's earlier use of Mark, and on the supposition of the insertion of a very limited amount of non-Marcan material, it offers an explanation of the peculiarities of Luke's order of events in the story of the Passion. At the same time it offers an additional explanation of the reduced verbal correspondence with Mark, for the adjustment to new contexts inevitably affects the wording of the transposed passages. In so far as these explanations win acceptance, the effect is to claim for the Marcan source a large number of the disputed passages, thus establishing the Marcan outline and dispensing with the need for the hypothesis of another Passion Narrative preferred to Mark.

The survey has been concerned with form, and other considerations must be given their due weight. Further, the conclusion to which it seems to point does not affect the argument based on the combination of non-Marcan material in the central portion of Luke and elsewhere. It is even consistent with the existence of a Proto-Luke, if that can be otherwise proved. It does not deny that Luke may have known a continuous Passion Narrative other than Mark's and may have drawn from it his additions to Mark. But it does indicate Mark as the principal source and framework for the Passion Narrative. And it directs our minds to a subject which is not only of historical interest but of great practical moment, the union in the early Christian tradition of freedom and faithfulness.

[1] It is not suggested that this gives a full explanation of the form of this passage.

The New Order.

III. Nature and Supernature.

By H. J. Massingham, Long Crendon, Bucks.

On Easter Sunday I went to the Parish Church of our village and found that large jars of forsythia, daffodils, narcissus, and cherry blossom had been placed in front of the pulpit and along the chancel steps. Against the grey Portland stone of the piers and walls the sprays were of exceptional beauty and delicacy, while the bright yellow colour of the daffodils was enhanced in the cool interior light almost as much as though the sun shone on them. But I heard nobody make any reference to them after the service, nor did the vicar mention them in his sermon. They seemed to have no more value or meaning to the congregation and the officiating priest than as a decoration in a room. Yet in that church on Easter Sunday these flowers and blossoms together with the occasion that had brought the worshippers together in it were unique. Only in Nature and only in the festival of the Christian Easter was there renewal and rebirth; elsewhere and over nearly the whole world destruction and death were paramount, just as mercilessly and ferociously in the so-called Christian countries as in those of other faiths or no supernatural faith at all.

It therefore seemed to be strange indeed that except at Christmas and harvest and Easter there was hardly any recognition whether in secular or religious circles of any association between these flowers and the sacred building where they were displayed, though the spring flowers were so obviously a symbol of the doctrine and the event that were being preached and celebrated. And is there none? Is Christianity indifferent to the world of Nature? Is its mission solely the saving of Christian souls, regardless of the interaction between man and Nature and of the fact that the earth and its fruits are the sustenance of mankind without which the human race would disappear utterly from the earth and after a certain passage of time 'leave not a wrack behind'?

Though the Church and Countryside Council has been recently founded, it would seem that the answer is, no, there is no such association. In other words, Nature is left to the mechanists and exploiters of earth, while Christianity is shorn of a large part of its historical traditions. For it is a great error to suppose that either the Jews of the Old Testament or primitive Christianity were devoid of a coherent and intelligible philosophy of the natural world. The Jews might have had some excuse for such neglect, since they were a pastoral people and nomadic or pastoral communities have less attachment to the soil than agricultural ones. Yet Old Testament literature is on the contrary packed with illustrative and hortatory references and admonitions concerning the relations between Nature and Supernature. Isaiah is particularly rich in them; the Prophets are represented as hermits in the wilderness, retired from the world of courts and public affairs except in emergency; Deuteronomy and Leviticus lay down certain laws and precepts for the right governance of husbandry and the care of stock; Moses was handed the Tables of the Commandments on Mount Sinai, while Job is unambiguous in describing the divine power as immanent in Nature.

In the New Testament these foreshadowings are made explicit, continuous and overwhelmingly precise. Christ was born in a village, not in some important town of the Romano-Syriac civilization, not merely in a village but in a manger to which the shepherds were summoned by angelic message, and the very bishop's crozier is nothing but a shepherd's crook. It is needless to point out how this earliest introduction of the shepherds was developed into a whole corpus of symbolism with sheep and shepherding for its basis. The Parables, again, are so saturated in natural and agricultural allusion and imagery that they would be robbed of half their beauty and significance without them. If the Incarnation had a rural matrix, the whole life of Christ was passed in a rural environment and His entry into the capital of Judæa was the signal for His death. Moreover, the very speech of the Gospels is a peasant one, not only in verbal analogy and illustration but in texture, fabric, and construction, while the major portion of the life of Christ was spent in the workshop of a village carpenter. Are we to assume that these scenes and incidents and surroundings have no more than a decorative meaning for us, like the flowers in the church on Easter Sunday?

The Roman Empire had become over-urbanized, like our own civilization has, at the period of the Gospels, and the diffusion of Christianity to the West from Rome, together with its modifications of Roman law in its own teachings and replace-

ment of a decadent pagan Nature-worship, doubtless weakened this primitive ruralism in which the Faith took birth. Nevertheless, it was maintained, especially in this country where the Celtic missionaries, many of them peasants themselves, evangelized the West from monasteries and centres of worship altogether of the wilds. The whole culture of the British Church was built up in remote and desolate country places utterly remote from the more civilized and habitable regions, on rocky islets, on barren promontories more inhospitable by far than the 'wilderness' of the Jewish Prophets, and the saints and hermits of this primitive Church practised a simple self-supporting husbandry, a love of Nature and a friendship with animals, the tales and legends of which survived in mediæval manuscripts, sculptures, and paintings.

The mediæval civilization itself, at any rate in the West, was rural to the bone, not in the sense that it eschewed the life of the town, but that its institutions were based upon a peasantry, upon craftsmanship and upon mutual obligations in the holding of land. Urban life was never isolated from the countryside like our own, and the very Trade Guilds were built up on the conception of the rural workshop and its system of apprenticeship. The Cistercians, the great rural colonizers, reclaimers of derelict land, husbandmen and flockmasters of the Middle Ages, formed self-contained communities within rural settings of special beauty and character, while fourteenth-century manuscripts were marginally decorated with scenes from Nature and animal life. The whole of the mediæval culture was indeed founded upon the rock of the agricultural way of life and its peculiarities of local self-government, private ownership, and economic self-sufficiency, and this was one of the reasons for its stability. Nor did the Renaissance and the Reformation break the continuity until the rise of the merchant class and the victory of Puritanism shifted the centre of gravity from the country to the town. But before the Civil War the seventeenth-century country parsonage was notable for its rural affinities, interests, responsibilities, and affections.

It is true that many cults and fashions ascribing the love of Nature to Satanic influences sprang up both in primitive and mediæval Christianity. But they were always denounced as heretical, and the authentic Christian tradition has always incorporated the doctrine of creation into the body of its beliefs. This is the doctrine of transcendence and immanence, opposed to pantheism on the one hand which repudiates the transcendence of God and to the idea of a Godship that plays no part in history or Nature on the other, which repudiates the immanence of God. Both are heresies since the essence of the Incarnation is that immanence and transcendence are parts of a single whole, the former a projection into the material world of the other, just as a work of art is the projection of the artist's idea into manifest form.

How then has it happened that in modern life the doctrine of God's immanence into the created world has suffered something like eclipse? One reason is undoubtedly the secularization of the modern world consequent upon various factors, not the least of which was the Industrial Revolution. Another is less obvious—namely the part played by the clergy in the Enclosures which dispossessed our native peasantry, precipitated the drift from the land, and finally established the city as the seat of all power. By abetting an absentee landlordism in robbing the small farmers of their land, the country clergy with some exceptions did more injury to the Christian Faith and its influence upon the laity than in any other event of our history. One of the greatest but little realized tasks of the churches is thus to reaffirm the doctrine of creation in its bearings upon the relations between Nature and Supernature. It will have to be done or the churches are doomed to share in that disintegration of modern civilization which is one of the plainest signs of the times. For excess urbanism will perish because it is contrary to the true nature of man and, unless the churches can reinterpret that Nature both from the guidance of tradition and in view of the desperate needs of a frustrated humanity to-day, they will be unable not only to disentangle themselves from an industrialism whose evils can no longer be concealed but from the judgment upon them.

There is indeed no hope of survival for any modern nation unless it recovers its agriculture as the foundation of its social, economic, and industrial life. This in its turn implies a complete change in the values and philosophy of current thought. Hitherto and for a century its attitude, based upon neo-Darwinism, has been predatory and acquisitive. The warning of the dust-bowl has been the nemesis of that attitude in its application to the earth which supports us. If the churches refuse to throw a religious sanction, justified in the traditions of Christianity, over the attempt to recover an organic way of life, the future will be a black one indeed. For unless this change does occur, the extinction of mankind from the earth is more than a possibility.

Literature.

ISAIAH.

Old Testament students have for some time been looking forward to the completion of Dr. E. J. Kissane's commentary on the Book of Isaiah. Volume II, dealing with Is 40–66, has now appeared—*The Book of Isaiah*, vol. ii. (Browne & Nolan; 21s. net), and it must be confessed that it does not wholly satisfy the expectations raised by the author's commentaries on Job and Is 1–39. True, we can detect the same high qualities of scholarship and devotion, but they tend to be obscured by the constant stress Dr. Kissane lays on the critical theory he adopts. He has revived a view which for some time has been regarded as obsolete: 'the whole series of poems forms a single organic whole . . . and the whole work . . . is written from the standpoint (actual or ideal) of the exile' (p. xxii). This does not formally exclude Isaianic authorship, but the book is treated as an exilic work, and the connexion with Isaiah is explained by the interesting hypothesis that the substance was handed down from the eighth century prophet, while the literary form is due to a writer of the sixth century. The book is constructed on a definite and logical plan, and contains ten sections, each section consisting of three poems, each poem strophically organized. Broadly speaking the theory resembles (though it is not identical with) that of Delitzsch. We need not dwell on the specific 'arguments' for this position. Would we could eliminate that term from our critical vocabulary! Our 'arguments' are hardly ever simple logical reasoning; they are either pieces of special pleading or attempts to explain the general impression made on us by the reading of a literary work. In this instance, the results speak strongly against the theory. Not only does it present us with a phenomenon almost unique in our prophetic literature—that in itself would not be fatal, but it involves an excessive number of transpositions and improbable divisions of the material. Much of this, it is true, may be ascribed to a strophic theory which, with comparatively few exceptions, is quite inapplicable to prophetic poetry. The text-critical notes, too, are unsatisfactory. Too much stress should not be laid on the numerous grammatical blunders in the Hebrew, for these may be due to an intractable printer. But in a number of cases the suggested emendations are unnecessary; many of them are not represented in the translation, though approved in the exegetical notes, while, more rarely, a conjectural emendation is tacitly assumed in the translation. It should, however, be said that Dr. Kissane's work is often an improvement on that of his predecessors, and some of his conjectures are really brilliant. The exegesis itself is normally sound, though occasionally interesting points are overlooked; the best sections are those which deal with the 'Servant Songs.' But while we may find much to criticize in his work, we must recognize that Dr. Kissane has made a valuable contribution to the study of this great book, a contribution which none of us can in future afford to neglect.

T. H. Robinson.

THE MAHABHARATA.

Most educated people are aware that India possesses two great epic poems, which are great at least in the sense that they are the longest epics in any language. These are the *Mahabharata* and the *Ramayana*. The former of these is so immense that few people even in India can claim any intimate acquaintance with more than one or two of the *disjecta membra* that make it up. For that reason it may be worth while to take note of a volume recently published in India called *The Mahabharata Story, Narrated in English*, by Mr. S. Sitaramayya, Trichinopoly. This is a single volume of over nine hundred pages in which an Indian scholar presents 'the Vyasa layer' of this poem. This he believes to be the main story and he claims to be able to isolate it from three other layers which have become incorporated with this primary one. He makes no high claims to scholarship but has been guided, he says, by a 'subjective test.' 'Whenever the story reads crisp and rapid and vibrant I say it belongs to the Vyasa layer.' That is probably as good a critical test as can be applied to a work of the complexity of this ancient scripture.

How formidable a task Mr. Sitaramayya has undertaken is suggested by the fact that the *Mahabharata* is about eight times the size of both the *Iliad* and the *Oydssey* combined. Its value lies in the fact that it is an immense store-house of the tales and ideas that have ruled the religious thought and practice of India through, perhaps, 2500 years. The *Bhagavadgita* found a place within its hospitable pages somewhere about the beginning of the Christian era and is the most widely known and influential of all its component parts.

The *Gita* does not therefore belong to the oldest stratum of the poem, and there are many interesting tales and much varied teaching, both of a much earlier and of a much later date, that find a place within it, sometimes pantheistic, sometimes theistic, and occasionally even atheistic in their purport. Siva and Vishnu alternate in their claims to the supreme place among the gods. It is perhaps the variety of its contents that has enabled it to occupy so dominant a place in the life of Hindu India. It is constantly being read and expounded to the common people. Mr. Sitaramayya is able to say, 'Even at the present day there is hardly an illiterate Hindu peasant who does not know some of its contents.' There is, for example, the story of Sakuntala from which Kalidasa fashioned his great play and the romantic tale of Nala.

To the student of folklore and the student of

religious ideas and practices alike the *Mahabharata* must always be a valuable repository of material and Mr. Sitaramayya's book may provide a useful introduction to it. NICOL MACNICOL.

A GREAT LITTLE BOOK.

The Master of the Temple, the Rev. Harold Anson, has written a book which is little in size and absurdly little in price but is one of those unique books which you want all your friends to read because it says what you believe with a simplicity, reality, and originality that you yourself are incapable of. The book is called *I Believe in God* (Muller; 1s. 6d. net). Canon Anson protests modestly that his little book is not intended for theologians and that it would seem meagre and slight in its treatment of the greatest themes. It does not seem so to me, though, indeed, I am no theologian. Certainly in such a limited space the author could not go systematically into all the issues raised. But he has succeeded to a marvel in what he set out to do, to put the truths of the Christian gospel in modern speech. But he has done more. He has put these truths not only in modern speech, but in a perfectly plain, perfectly expressed, untheological modern way of thinking. He has got to the essence of the truths and utters them as if they were new and newly discovered and could be said if not in the language of the market-place at least in that of the cultivated layman who knows no theology. I am really trying to say that this is a book that takes the Christian truth out of the theological world into the lay world and preserves all that is essential in it as a gospel. Canon Anson says: 'I know that there is still a great need for a short and simple exposition of the fundamental truths which all who wish to be called Christian must hold.' I wouldn't have said so, there are so many books of popular apologetic. But there is certainly a great need for this book, and one would hope that it may become widely known. The chapters are entitled: I Believe in God; The Nature of God; Jesus; Atonement; Resurrection; The Holy Spirit; The Reign of God; Fight the Good Fight. F. J. RAE.

Two Tracts for the Times, by the Rev. Frederic Platt, M.A., D.D. (Epworth Press; 1s. net), has as its main object to point out that the antithesis 'evangelical' and 'sacramental' is not an antithesis at all, that each represents an essential element in Christian faith and practice, that in order to be truly sacramental a Christian must be evangelical. The Christianity of St. Paul, for example, is not (as so often averred) purely spiritual and ethical. The sacramental principle is a vital element in his teaching. The same is true of John Wesley. The main contention of the 'Tracts' is expounded in detail and an appeal is made to the leaders of evangelical thought to examine the antithesis afresh with a view to the reconciling of divergent opinions and organizations.

It is a somewhat unusual thing for an author to say of his book: 'This book has been a great surprise to me.' But that is what Dr. J. Scott Lidgett says of *God and Man* (Epworth Press; 3s. 6d. net). He had an experience which is, happily, not unknown to preachers. He was resting last autumn, reflecting thankfully that his literary work was done, yet shortly afterwards he woke with the mandate, 'write on God and Man.' At once the subject began to flow in upon him and this compulsion lasted till the book was finished. The date of its completion was the seventy-sixth anniversary of the day when he first received the sacrament of the Lord's Supper! Supposing this to be at sixteen years of age that makes Dr. Lidgett ninety-two. This is nearly incredible when one reads the book. Its grasp, its mental alertness, its vitality, its vigorous thinking keep us interested and stimulated as the author discourses on the sense of God, the idea of God, the approach of God to man, God and progress, God in Jesus Christ, God is love. There is a chapter of special value on 'Godlessness.' It was a happy inspiration that wakened this distinguished churchman from his lethargy, for he has given us a book full of instruction and good guidance on the essentials of true religion.

All who have to teach the Old Testament to children will be interested in Mr. Ellis W. Heaton's series, *Hero Stories from the Old Testament for the Over-Twelves*. Four parts have been published, each of about twenty-four pages, at 6d. each (Epworth Press). The narratives carry us from Abraham to the division of the kingdom. They are told in very simple language, and offer a sound introduction to Old Testament studies. Mr. Heaton has made good use of modern scholarship, and his experience as a teacher should ensure that his presentation is just the right one for the class of children he has in view.

In his book *Protestants, the Free Churches and the Future* (Epworth Press; 6s. net), the Rev. R. Scott Frayn, B.A., B.D., Ph.D., makes a strong plea for 'radical revision of denominational outlook in the Free Churches of our land, and for action in respect of long-projected schemes of union among the Protestants.' The book is rather critical than constructive and it is doubtful if it will accomplish much. Indiscriminate criticism is so easy and a picture may be drawn of Christian disunion which comes near being a caricature. Is it true to say of the Free Churches that they only maintain 'a specious cordiality' but 'cannot really worship and pray together'? At the same time it must be said that the writer, out of a long experience of Church life and serious reflection on its problems, has many criticisms of value to offer on such topics as the simplification of the Creed, the training of the ministry and the conduct of Christian worship.

The Rev. Leslie D. Weatherhead, M.A., has written a book on the Parables which has passed at once into a second edition. Its title is *In Quest*

of a Kingdom (Hodder & Stoughton ; 7s. 6d. net), and it is perhaps the best thing he has written. It consists of twenty-three sermons preached at the City Temple and re-written to give unity and concentration as an exposition of the teaching of Jesus about the Kingdom of God. Let it be said at once that these sermons are examples of the finest evangelical preaching. The style is vivacious and popular, the illustrations numerous and telling, and the whole effect deeply impressive. Psychology, though still a useful handmaid, is no longer mistress of the writer's thought. He strikes with sure hand the dominant notes of the Christian gospel. He earnestly commends the grace of God in contrast to every form of legalism or loveless morality ; he calls for repentance and regeneration before all mere reform. He makes passionate and winsome appeal to the individual to enter into trustful and loving fellowship with God in Christ, while to the community he fearlessly sets forth the demands of the Kingdom of God for the birth of a new public spirit as the first essential for the solution of world problems. It is a book in which readers and especially preachers will find much sane guidance and inspiration. We note a historical slip on p. 120, where Peter Böhler's somewhat dubious advice to John Wesley is given as Wesley's advice to one of his preachers.

In *Outline Talks for Women's Meetings*, by the Rev. J. W. James (Independent Press ; 1s. 6d. net), the writer follows a somewhat unusual plan. He begins by telling some anecdote or legend at some length and then adds what he calls a 'development,' which is a very brief sentence or two suggesting what application may be made of the story. In other words the moral is not given in detail but merely suggested for the reader to develop. For those in search of illustrations these outlines, thirty in number, should provide a goodly supply.

The Word of God in Theory and Experience (1s. net) is the title of the Dr. Williams' Annual Lecture for 1943, given by Professor J. Vernon Lewis, M.A., B.D., at the Presbyterian College, Caermarthen. It deals almost entirely with the Old Testament, showing that it is a vital part of the Word of God, and especially that its message of the living God active in the control of world history has a special timeliness in our day. Though somewhat diffuse in form the lecture is packed with good things and highly suggestive.

An A.B.C. of Christianity for Youth Leaders and others is how *Power to Live* is described by its writer, Mr. J. Leonard Clough (Lutterworth Press ; 2s. net). The inspiration behind the book is the conviction that what the world needs for its 'reconstruction' is the Christian religion, and a well-devised outline of instruction on what that religion is and how it is to be propagated is given here. How to begin, what to believe, how to grow, what to do, embrace all the subjects intellectual and practical that need to be considered. Ample guidance is given for discussion groups, for the author is a strong believer in discussion and in practical application. The book is well written and fully deserves the appreciation which is given to it in a Foreword by the Rev. Leslie Weatherhead.

The late President of Magdalen and Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford was a man blessed with many friends and admirers, and they will be glad to possess this little book of his letters, full of lightness, wit, and gay affection—*The Letters of George S. Gordon*, 1902–1942 (Milford ; 10s. 6d. net). These are not letters the writer would ever have dreamed of destining for print, not that they are very intimate, but because they are so casual and unconsidered. Therein must lie their charm. But one could wish for some more formal monument to so distinguished a scholar and teacher. That may still be to come.

Heroes of the Call and Quest : Junior Lessons, vol. iii. is another of the indispensable books issued by the Religious Education Press (cloth boards, 5s. ; paper covers, 4s. 6d. net). This volume is devoted to the Junior Lessons on the agreed Syllabuses, and the notes are done by well-known and experienced educationists. Every lesson is furnished not only with explanatory notes but with illustrations and background information as well as guidance for practical work. The maps are clear and sufficient. The subjects dealt with here are : St. Peter's Life, Witnesses for Christ outside Scripture, Famous Missionaries, Old Testament Heroes, and finally a section on Prayer. These books are so well-known and so highly valued that it is sufficient to call attention to this most recent issue.

The Passion According to St. John (Ryerson Press, Toronto ; 60 cents) consists of Addresses delivered in St. Andrew's Church, Halifax, during Passion Week by the Rev. James W. Falconer, D.D., Professor in Pine Hill Divinity Hall, Halifax, Nova Scotia. The Addresses, which are simple and clear and the expression of a scholarly mind, must have admirably served their purpose ; for they are instinct with devotional feeling. Many will turn with special interest to the chapter entitled 'The Lord's Prayer,' which is an exposition of St. John 17. What is called The Lord's Prayer was so called because it was given by Jesus to His disciples as a form for them to use continually ; but it was not used by Jesus Himself. In St. John 17 we have, says Dr. Falconer, what may well be called the genuine Lord's Prayer, for in it Jesus pours forth the desires of His soul in personal fellowship with His Father. In the chapter mentioned Dr. Falconer makes a useful comparison of the distinctive features of each of the two prayers.

An extremely interesting, intelligent, and useful book on the religious training of children, especially

the under-tens, has been written by an expert who possesses every qualification of professional skill and religious sympathy for doing so—*A Child's Personal Religion*, by Miss Noël E. Nicholl (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net). Miss Nicholl has the affection for little children which gives insight into their needs and qualities, and this is abundantly evident in the book under notice. In two chapters, 'Opportunities of Daily Life' and 'Religious Observances' (a wise use of the Bible, Prayer Time, and the Church), we have constant examples of her wisdom, and parents as well as teachers may well profit from the guidance she offers. It is not often one comes on so good a book as this. It is beautifully produced and furnished with delightful illustrations by Leo Dowd.

The Chief Rabbi must be regarded as one of the leading figures of our time, and anything he has to say will be received with attention. His latest volume is a collection of short pieces—addresses, sermons, letters, and the like—issued by the Soncino Press under the title *Early and Late* (10s. 6d. net). The items are not all of recent date; one of the eighty odd pieces goes back to 1894, but the great majority refer, directly or indirectly, to the present crisis in the history of Jewry. We find in them what we have long learnt to expect from Dr. Hertz, not only the powerful utterances of a great champion of Israel, but the attitude of a deeply religious spirit, and if any would know the essential nature of the Jew and the way in which he faces a hostile world, he cannot do better than read this volume.

Esther and Antisemitism.

By the Reverend T. E. N. Pennell, M.A., Walthamstow, London.

Haman in the Book of Esther is the first antisemite, whether in history or literature. The term antisemitism is really a misnomer, for it is only the Jews of the Semitic peoples against whom this virulence is directed. Nor is it apparent in the pre-exilic history of the Jews: until they were scattered amongst the nations they were no more exposed to special hatred than other peoples. The Dispersion, however, both sharpened the sense of their special calling, racial and religious, and forced it upon the attention of the nations. 'In countries with a large Jewish national minority it is obvious that the presence of an ethnic mass with its own tradition, schools, and language, creates a special problem with regard to civil life and the general welfare of the State' (J. Maritain, *Antisemitism*, 2).

Haman, nevertheless, is not a representative figure of the Persian period. So far as our knowledge goes, antisemitism only emerges in the Græco-Roman period, first in Alexandria, where it is associated with the name of the Egyptian priest Manetho (270–250 B.C.) and with the riots of A.D. 38 onwards. Individual antisemitic writers are known in the ancient world, the earliest of whom is Apion (against whom Josephus' work is directed), but numbering amongst them prominent names like Tacitus, Horace, Juvenal and Martial. With all this, no general feeling of hostility to the Jews is apparent: indeed it was more a literary than a popular feature, with the partial exception of Alexandria. Apart from mockery of Jewish practices, *e.g.* circumcision, the Sabbath, the food-laws, two chief accusations were levied:

(1) ἀθεότης (atheism), from the Jewish rejection of all Divine worship but their own, and also of every image.

(2) ἀμιξία (unsociableness), from the social exclusiveness involved in the food-laws and the Levitical laws of purity, interpreted by Tacitus as 'adversus omnes alios hostile odium.'

The hatred directed against the Christians seems to have been similar to, and perhaps more violent than against the Jews; cf. the charge of godlessness, libertinism, incest, ritual murder, the burning of Rome.

Antisemitism proper only comes into being after the establishment of Christianity as the official religion of the Empire. The Jews are now depicted as the enemies of God, the murderers of Christ. Honourable careers are closed to them. Conversion to Judaism becomes a criminal offence. But still the attitude is ecclesiastical rather than popular: the motives are religious and missionary, even though mixed with cupidity. It was the Crusades that aroused popular feeling—why fight the enemies of the faith in the Holy Land if the enemies of God at home are left? With the thirteenth century the blood accusation comes to the front, and a decree of the Council of Breslau in 1266 establishes a system of forced segregation. There follows the terrible story of the poll-tax, the yellow badge, the ghetto, the despoliation and maltreatment, the expulsions and the massacres, which defile later mediæval history.

The Reformation marks a turning-point. Hostility to the Jews for not becoming Christian converts is, in view both of the past and of the new religious enthusiasm, not unnaturally present. But the greater estimation of the Bible and

the deeper insight into Jewish mentality was calculated to counteract antisemitism. There was a definitely pro-Jewish feeling in puritan England. Jewish emancipation, however, really becomes effective after the mid-eighteenth century, strengthened by the French Revolution. In spite of the antisemitic reaction after the fall of Napoleon, the growing liberalism of the eighteen thirties meant that before 1870 emancipation had taken place generally over central and western Europe: hostility still continued in Russia and Poland.

Modern antisemitism arose in the 'seventies, with Germany (as in the post-Napoleonic period) the citadel. Germany even held two ritual murder trials in 1891 and 1900, and has the infamous name of Theodor Fritsch. France will be remembered by the Dreyfus affair; Austria, Hungary, and Roumania have a sorry record; Russia, especially under Alexander III. and Nicholas II., was the scene of endless pogroms, wholesale raids and massacres, from 1881 onwards. In 1914 the Jews were practically without rights in Russia and Roumania. After 1918 other problems held for a time the attention of the nations. Russia pursued the policy of assimilation; the Revolution leaders were few of them Jews, but Russian Jews can hardly be blamed for supporting the Revolution. In the Weimar Republic the Jews became more and more isolated, both socially and economically, and with the rise of Hitler antisemitism once more became a part of State policy. It has infected not only Germany but every country in contact with Germany. Nor is it absent from the popular mind in England.

In the long history of antisemitism what are the grounds for persecution? W. W. Simpson in *Youth and Antisemitism* gives this summary of the present accusations:

(1) Charges based upon theoretical suppositions, (*a*) that there is an international Jewish plot to gain supreme control of world affairs, (*b*) that the Jews are of an inferior racial stock, (*c*) that the Jews practise ritual murder.

(2) Charges partially based upon facts, but in which the facts are distorted, (*a*) that the Jews are responsible for Communism, (*b*) that Jews exercise an undue influence in national and international affairs, (*c*) that Jewish commercial morality is of a very low order, (*d*) that the Jews are unpleasant and inconsiderate neighbours.

Refutation of these charges never has the slightest effect, nor does the positive side carry weight, as set out, *e.g.* by Cecil Roth in *The Jewish Contribution to Civilization*. That antisemitism springs from roots other than reason is evident also from the preposterous lies that have marked its course. Thus the terrible pogroms in the middle of the fourteenth century were brought about by the rumour that the Black Death was due to the Jews having poisoned the wells. The antisemites of the time believed this just as firmly as the German antisemites believe that the Jews brought about the 1914–18 war and the defeat of Germany.

Dr. J. Parkes in *The Conflict between the Church and the Synagogue* argues that the major cause of modern antisemitism is the misunderstanding between the Church and the Synagogue in early Christian times. In its earliest days the Christian community was almost entirely Jewish, but by the end of the New Testament period the Jews had rejected the gospel. Two things contributed to this:

(1) The admission of Gentiles into the Church on terms which did not require acceptance of the full Jewish ritual law.

(2) The development of the orthodox doctrine of the Person of Christ.

From that time the main development of Christianity was on Gentile soil, and the original Jewish Christian Church dwindled and vanished. The Gentile Christian Church, never sympathetic to the Jews, tended to become anti-Jewish, especially through—

(*a*) Failure to understand the true significance of the Jewish Scriptures; their interpretation was confined to a reading back of the events and ideas of the New Testament;

(*b*) Failure to see the Crucifixion in its true historical perspective; it became the custom to lay the guilt upon all Jews in every age.

Again, while religious differences between Christianity and Judaism have been a fruitful cause of persecution over many centuries, they neither cover the whole field, nor can they be extended to explain the situation in the pre-Christian era and to-day. The effect of religious bitterness can of course drag on (cf. Hitler's statement, 'By fighting against the Jews I am doing the Lord's work' (*Mein Kampf*, 36)). But modern antisemitism took its rise from economic factors (not religious) in nineteenth-century Germany, *e.g.* the influence of Jews in public affairs, their predominance in newspapers and art and trade, their financial power. That this also is not the whole truth is shown by the fact that the great mass of Jews were, and are, neither bankers nor financiers, but urban poor.

Esther really provides the classical example, the prototype of antisemitism, the prophetic picture. Antisemitism can be studied in this Book with the clearness of distance. The springs of Haman's plot were:

(1) Personal pique. 'And when Haman saw

that Mordecai bowed not down, nor did him reverence, then was Haman full of wrath' (3^5).

(2) The cruelty of which human nature is capable. 'But he thought scorn to lay hands on Mordecai alone; for they had showed him the people of Mordecai: wherefore Haman sought to destroy all the Jews that were throughout the whole kingdom of Ahasuerus, even the people of Mordecai' (3^6).

(3) Covetousness: Haman's bribe to the king gained what was evidently his desire. 'And the king said unto Haman, The silver is given to thee, the people also, to do with them as it seemeth good to thee' (3^{11}).

Behind the personal factors lay others belonging to a bigger issue:

(1) An inferiority complex. Mordecai's refusal of homage was partly from a proud racial consciousness, partly from the conviction that homage was owed to God alone. 'He had told them that he was a Jew' (3^4). The Jew was in a peculiar position under alien rule. Haman's reaction was against a position in which he felt himself inferior.

(2) A State reason for action. 'And Haman said unto king Ahasuerus, There is a certain people scattered abroad and dispersed among the peoples in all the provinces of thy kingdom; and their laws are diverse from those of every people; neither keep they the king's laws: therefore it is not for the king's profit to suffer them' (3^8).

(3) Finance. 'If it please the king, let it be written that they be destroyed: and I will pay ten thousand talents of silver into the hands of those that have the charge of the king's business, to bring it into the king's treasuries' (3^9).

There is also this. The Book of Esther is in a sacred context, and the Jew can never be understood apart from the context of religion. As John Macmurray has stressed in *The Clue to History*, the Hebrews are unique in that they were not only religious as a primitive society, but they developed an elaborate civilization and culture without ceasing to be religious. Art and science, politics, law, morality and philosophy all continued as aspects of religion. Religion was never an aspect of life: it was all-inclusive of life; the Hebrews thought this world religiously. Not that tendencies to dualism did not occur: indeed their whole history, as described in the Old Testament, is the story of a continuous struggle to overcome the continuous tendency towards dualism. But an integral religious community they remained, even after the fall of Jerusalem: this is the significance of Ezra's work, and the character of the Diaspora. Action and reflection are at one: nationality and community are co-ordinated. Here is the fundamental cleavage between the Jews and all peoples, running so deep that the sharpest antagonism can arise from the slightest occasion. The Jews are religious in the only true sense of the word: and they are the only people who are religious. 'If the world hates the Jews, it is because the world clearly senses that they will always be "outsiders" in a supernatural sense, it is because the world detests their passion for the absolute, and the unbearable stimulus which it inflicts' (J. Maritain, *Antisemitism*, 20).

Christianity was the culmination of Judaism (cf. the charges levied in turn against Jews and Christians). Jesus Christ completed the prophetic development and released Judaism from its national reference. 'Spiritually we are Semites' (Pius XI., in September 1938). The Jewish rejection of Christianity was a rejection of their own reality, and their will to power frustrated itself, to their own destruction. Religion is the true universal community, the reality of life, the ultimate power. Because of this, Christianity defeated the will to power in the Roman Empire, and the alliance with Christianity sealed the Empire's fate. At the same time it created the dualism of the spiritual and the temporal power, which characterizes mediæval society. 'On the practical side Christianity became dualist by accepting the Roman structure of law, organization, and administration as the guarantee of the unity of the Church. On the theoretical side it fell into dualism by the acceptance of the thought forms of Greek philosophy.' The development is reflected in the adoption of antisemitism, antagonism to the unified religious life of Judaism. 'The ecclesiastical will to power worked out its own frustration, and the completion of this process, by weakening the forces of suppression, brought the Christian intention to consciousness. This is the significance of the Renaissance and Reformation. But because the dualism of mind and of society remains, and because the suppressing agency in society is the religious organization, Christianity asserts itself in consciousness as a secular movement towards freedom and equality and common humanity as the basis of society' (J. Macmurray, *op. cit.*). Hence the movement towards Jewish emancipation, rising from the Reformation, and in evidence from the later eighteenth century. Fascism, the final stage of the development of individual self-consciousness, 'discovers that the source of all this pressure towards progress, equality, freedom, and common humanity is—the Jew.' Hatred thus burns again.

What has the Book of Esther to say to antisemitism?

(1) Its futility as a policy. 'For we are sold, I and my people, to be destroyed, to be slain, and to perish. But if we had been sold for bondmen and bondwomen, I had held my peace, although the adversary could not have compensated for the king's damage' (7^4). The 'king's damage' is the diminution of the State's internal energies which antisemitism involves. Cf. J. Maritain, 'Antisemitism makes impossible any solution of the concrete difficulties involved in such cases. Not only does it falsify by exaggeration the factual data, but it removes the preliminary conditions required for any practical solution' (*op. cit.*, 3).

(2) The will to power defeats itself. 'It was turned to the contrary, that the Jews had rule over them that hated them' (9^1). Cf. J. Macmurray, 'It is the Jewish consciousness that is the enemy, not an organized Jewish army, not even an insurrection of the Jews in Germany. It is the hidden penetration of the Jewish spirit into the Gentile mind that is the danger; and it is a danger because the "Aryan" mind cannot resist it but must succumb' (*op. cit.*, 226). Thus the German adoption of a racial conception of society as the basis of political unity is definitely Jewish, not Aryan.

(3) The issue is the kingdom of God upon earth. 'For Mordecai the Jew was next unto king Ahasuerus, and great among the Jews, and accepted of the multitude of his brethren; seeking the good of his people, and speaking peace to all his seed' (10^3). Cf. J. Maritain, 'Israel passionately hopes, waits, yearns for the coming of God on earth, the kingdom of God *here below*. With an eternal will, a supernatural and non-rational will, it desires justice in time, in nature, and in the cities of man' (*op. cit.*, 18).

Not only in delineation of the truth of the situation, but in solution of the problem, Esther can be our guide. Three factors contributed to the turn of events in the story:

(1) Remembrance of the service rendered to the State by Mordecai. 'And it was found written, that Mordecai had told of Bigthana and Teresh, two of the king's chamberlains, of those that kept the door, who had sought to lay hands on the king Ahasuerus' (6^2). Knowledge and appreciation of the contribution of Judaism to our present good must be made widespread. Jewish experience has been one of the major factors determining European history, civilization, and culture.

(2) The duty of Jews in positions of responsibility and influence. 'Then Mordecai bade them return answer unto Esther, Think not with thyself that thou shalt escape in the king's house, more than all the Jews. For if thou altogether holdest thy peace at this time, then shall relief and deliverance arise to the Jews from another place, but thou and thy father's house shall perish: and who knoweth whether thou art not come to the kingdom for such a time as this?' (4^{13-14}). The counsel and probity of prominent Jews is of inestimable importance.

(3) A resurrection of spiritual forces. 'Then Esther bade them return answer unto Mordecai, Go, gather together all the Jews that are present in Shushan, and fast ye for me, and neither eat nor drink three days, night or day: I also and my maidens will fast in like manner; and so will I go in unto the king, which is not according to the law: and if I perish, I perish' (4^{15-16}). This is the power of religion, possessed by nothing else—politics, charity nor settlement schemes—to seize the essential means of achievement.

Antisemitism faces us as the last great struggle, 'last' in the sense that there is nothing more ultimate than the spiritual issue of the uprising of evil against the Divine rule. It is the apocalyptic issue: we are in apocalyptic days. 'Never before in the history of the world were the Jews persecuted so universally; and never has persecution attacked, as to-day, both Jews and Christians. We can see here a sign that we have entered upon an apocalyptic period of history; this is also a sign that we must shape our means to the conditions of such a period' (J. Maritain, *op. cit.*, 56).

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The Statue which Spoke.

By the Reverend Philip W. Lilley, M.A., Rhu.

'Jesus said . . . "Take courage, my child."'—Mt 9[2] (Weymouth).

I wonder how many of you boys and girls have been to London City, and have seen the famous statue of Lord Nelson in Trafalgar Square with the lions crouching at its foot? Nelson, you remember, saved his country from disaster at the great battle of Trafalgar in 1805. His memory inspires us all to-day in the midst of this awful war. It is about this statue of Lord Nelson, mounted high upon the column that I wish to speak to you and especially of what it did for a young boy called John many years ago.

His father, Colonel Denys Reitz, was in his office in Trafalgar Square one day, when a telegraph boy handed him a 'wire.' It was a cable from his wife in South Africa and it told him that their son John had lost his right eye and his right hand in an explosive accident and was in a hospital, very ill indeed. This was very sad news. Full of grief, the father gazed out on the busy Square for a few moments, seeing nothing. Then, suddenly, he looked up and there stood Nelson on his column, *with one hand and one eye*. It was wonderful, was it not (so at least he thought) that he should have been on the very spot where he was to get such sad news and at the same time receive immediate comfort in his sorrow? He rushed in and despatched a message to John—'Terribly sorry, but through my office window stands Lord Nelson, who climbed very high *with one hand and one eye*.'

By these words he meant (and John fully understood) that Nelson did not allow his wounds in battle to hinder him from doing his duty and reaching the highest point of fame. The result was that through this message John gained great patience and endurance and was very good and brave. He steadily gained strength and made a grand recovery. You see, I am sure, how the statue of Nelson spoke to this lad who was so far away and breathed something of Nelson's own courage into his heart, so that he refused to be downcast because of his terrible injuries. This Nelson column was, so to speak, a 'sermon in stone.'

Nelson was the saviour of his country a hundred and fifty years ago, but we remember a much greater hero than Nelson who was also brave, His name is Jesus Christ. He had no one on earth to cheer Him on to victory. The whole world was against Him. He was often sore wounded through the hatred of men, and He died a lonely death on a cross. But He is the Saviour of the world to-day. He saves us from the power of evil. I want you to listen for His voice in the Gospel stories, to watch Him as He stood alone, calm and serene in the hour of danger, tender and forgiving to the last in the midst of pain. So He triumphed in the end, and His Spirit still works in the world. If you ask Him, Jesus will give you, too, something of His heart of oak and His Spirit of steel, and, like John Reitz, you will be strong and brave.

Daylight Saving.

By the Reverend A. A. Mackenzie, B.D., Flemington, Victoria, Australia.

'Hast thou commanded the morning?'—Job 38[12].

What do you know about Daylight Saving? That is the practice of putting the clocks forward one hour during the summer time when the days are long. The aim, you know, is to avoid the use of gas and electricity by saving the daylight. If you get up an hour earlier and go to bed an hour earlier, you will save an hour's artificial light—7 hours a week saved by 7 million people. Work that out and see how much it amounts to.

Some people say it is only a trick we play on ourselves to get ourselves up early. We are disinclined, they say, to get up at six when our usual time for rising is seven, so we deceive ourselves by putting the clock forward. Australia tried it in 1917. I was in the country at the time, and I remember a farmer—who didn't like it—saying it would make no difference to the fowls and the cows. They would still get up and come home at the same time and take no notice of the clock. That of course is quite true; but then a man—and that means you—is better than a cow or a fowl. That is what Jesus meant when He said 'How much is a man better than a sheep.' Tell me, why is a man better than a sheep? Why are *you* better than a sheep? Because you've got brains to think with and sense to know what is good and wise and helpful.

Now, you and I are meant to command the morning. And the most obvious way is by getting up and using it. The boy or girl who can't get up early is not commanding the morning. He is not even commanding himself, and that's a disgrace. But *you* can get up, and you *do* get up, when you think it is worth while. What about Christmas morning or a picnic day?

There was a good man who lived some years ago, and in a book he wrote he said this: 'I take it for granted that every Christian that is in health is up early in the morning; for it is much more reasonable to suppose a person is up early because he is a Christian than because he is a labourer or a tradesman, or a servant, or has business that wants him.' That means we get up early not

because we have to go to school or to work, but because we are *followers of Jesus*.

I'm afraid it is hardly safe to-day to say all followers of Jesus are early risers, and those who are not followers are the ones lying in bed. There are many people down at the beach before church goes in. But none the less it is true to say that getting up early is one way in which we can be like Jesus. In that we can follow Him. We read of Him that 'In the morning, rising up a great while before day, he went out . . . into a solitary place, and there prayed.' At another time He Himself said, 'Walk while ye have the light, lest darkness come upon you: for he that walketh in darkness knoweth not whither he goeth.' That last bit is especially true of the people in the blackout, isn't it?

Daylight Saving, you see, lengthens out the day, and lengthens it in the morning. Most people, especially young people, try to lengthen it at the other end. You do that, don't you? It isn't easy for Mother to get you to bed. The result is she can't get you up in the morning. Now listen, if we command the morning we command the day, if we lose the morning we are behind all through the day. Have you ever heard your Mother say 'what a difference an extra half hour in the morning makes'? And if we command the days, we command the years and *our life*. So you see to it that you train yourself to get up early as Jesus did. That will be one good step in the way of following Him.

The Christian Year.

FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Secret of the Christian Life.

BY THE REVEREND J. G. RIDDELL, M.A., PROFESSOR OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY, UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW.

'Jesus . . . being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, . . . hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear.'—Ac 2^{33}.

St. Peter was speaking to people who were amazed at the extraordinary behaviour of the Christian disciples. 'What meaneth this?' they were saying to one another, and their question has been echoed in every century of the Church's life, and is still on the lips of many in our own time. Can you not imagine that Hitler must often have asked in bewilderment about the incalculable resistance of Christians to his new order and their readiness to suffer untold hardship rather than accept it? Must not the Quislings in occupied countries be puzzled by the hard core of antagonism to their rule which they find in the Christian Church? The same kind of problem perplexes men and women who find Christian missionaries coming to live among them and serving them in hospital or school or church. What do they expect to gain? Why do they undertake so exacting and seemingly unrewarding a task? The problem of Christian behaviour may be less immediately perplexing in our own land which still retains some sort of Christian standard, yet every now and then we find ourselves startled and humiliated by some fresh evidence of what the followers of Jesus can do and can endure. The question of the New Testament comes to us in ever fresh forms but with unchanging significance. What does such conduct mean? What is the secret of it? Why do people come to behave in unexpected and unpredictable fashion?

The popular explanation was that the Christians were full of new wine. But that only showed how far those who gave it were from grasping the real answer to their question. These men, St. Peter declares, are not intoxicated but inspired. They are like those who have dreamed a dream or seen a vision and know that their dream has come true and that their vision will all be fulfilled. They are inspired by the knowledge of all that God has done, by their belief in what He is doing and by their confidence in what He yet will do. The Father's care for His sinful children and His compassion on a needy world have been manifest in His action. The birth of Jesus at Bethlehem and His baptism at Jordan; His ministry in Nazareth and Galilee; His entry into Jerusalem and His agony in Gethsemane; His trial and His cross; the wonder of the empty tomb and the ascension into heaven—all these events made possible the happenings of the day of Pentecost, the story of the Church's life, the amazing behaviour of Christian folk. Jesus, cried St. Peter with the boldness of faith's insight, whom ye have taken and have crucified and slain, God hath raised up . . . being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear.

There was no other answer then and there is none now to the questions people ask about Christian character and conduct. Nothing less than the mighty act of God's redeeming power in Jesus Christ was needful. Nothing less than this has been accomplished and in it lies the secret of Christian living. A new way of life with wide horizons and far flung frontiers has been opened to the men and women who follow Christ. With Jesus enthroned and the Holy Spirit's presence manifest in their midst the disciples are like men living in a new world. The love of the Father that withheld not His only Son; the pity and faithfulness of the Son, His victory over sin and death; the coming of the Holy Spirit to change men's lives and inspire them with limitless power—these are the conditions of the Christian life. In no formal theological language, but in the burning passion of his faith, St. Peter proclaims this fundamental truth. When Jesus is exalted we are right to look for wondrous manifestations of God's power. Not for nothing have we been brought again in the sequence of the Christian year from Christmas to Good Friday, from Easter Day and Pentecost to Trinity Sunday. That is no artificial sequence of dates in the ecclesiastical calendar. It is the recalling and reaffirmation of

the great events enacted once and for all in God's invasion of our human life. Little wonder that men were amazed and asked, 'What meaneth this?' They were witnessing the climax of the great drama of divine action on man's behalf. The conquering Christ, at the right hand of God exalted, is proving the truth of all His promises and manifesting the glory of His triumph by His shedding forth the Holy Spirit in all His plenitude of grace.

That Christ's enthronement preceded the coming of the Holy Spirit, as He Himself had declared that it must, is not merely a fact of history. It is true to-day for ourselves, for the Church and for the world. It is the secret of Christian living now as then. Always, when this is done, the promises of the gospel are fulfilled and the divine power of the Holy Spirit bestowed, not as a kind of luxury which the Christian can afford to do without, but as the essential condition of his life in Christ. Such power for Christian living—sorely needed in the world of to-day—cannot come unless Jesus is enthroned. The tragedy of the world situation and the weakness of the Church, exaggerated as it often is, and the poverty of our own Christian witness can all be traced back to failure to give Christ the highest place—the place that is His by right. The purpose of God has not changed. The promises of Jesus have not failed. The gift of the Holy Spirit may still be ours. The Strong Name of the Trinity stands triumphant in the glory of eternal Godhead. Here is the confidence of Christian faith. Here is the secret of Christian living. Jesus . . . being by the right hand of God exalted, hath shed forth this, which ye now see and hear.

Do you ever ask yourself why it should be to a generation like ours that the stupendous task of living for God in the world of to-day is committed? Do you ever wonder why the Church, facing world-shaking events, has so many weak and ignorant and sinful like ourselves in its ranks? Surely, we say, a more heroic age should have been matched with this hour? Surely the Church of the saints and martyrs would have encountered more worthily the tremendous issues of such a time? There is no answer to these questions but the fact that in His wisdom God has set us to this task—and the assurance that He is the same God whose mighty acts have changed the history of the world. Jesus, the victor over sin and death, is still exalted at God's right hand and claims enthronement in the world for which He died, in the Church for which He gave Himself, in the hearts of those whom He has made His own. Christ is still the Conqueror's name. He still sheds forth the Holy Spirit's power to make men and women more than conquerors: to enable them to live for Him in amazing ways. This is no carried story—no wishful thinking. It is the simple truth that Jesus enthroned keeps His promises to you and me. In face of danger and difficulties, of trials and temptations; in anxiety for our loved ones, in sorrow for our own sins; in life and in death there is no failure on the part of Christ. He is able still to keep that which we have committed to His care. Not the magnitude of our tasks but the limitless resources that He can bestow should occupy our minds. Not our own achievements but the mighty acts of God should be the theme of all our thinking. Not the things that confront us in the present struggle or the building of a new world order alone, but the grandeur of God's purpose and all that He has done for its fulfilment should dominate our thoughts. In Jesus enthroned is the source of our confidence, the secret of our Christian life, the assurance of power to witness for Him to-day. So may it be that, as on the day of Pentecost, and often in the Church's history since then, the wonder of the gospel shall be manifest in His followers' lives and His strength made perfect in our weakness, to the glory of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit.

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Alas, what fools!

BY THE REVEREND ALEXANDER CAMPSIE, M.C., M.A., CHAPLAIN, ROYAL NAVY.

'The fool hath said in his heart, There is no God.'—Ps 14[1].

And there are many kinds of fools, and many ways of saying that 'there is no God.' At the outset, it is well that we should be clear on one point—that the person to whom the Psalmist is here referring is not the intellectual atheist, the person who has given his mind to the study of world processes and natural phenomena, or, after long and serious reflection upon the content of human experience, has come consciously and deliberately to the conclusion that there isn't any God. The Psalmist is not thinking of a fool of that variety, for the simple reason that he did not exist in the Psalmist's day. It took this brave, new modern world to produce him. It is the *practical* atheist to whom the Psalmist is referring, the person who to all intents and purposes denies the existence of God by the manner of his living. And this is a common type, well known in the Psalmist's day as in our own.

No, the person of whom the Psalmist is speaking is not he who after reflection deliberately denies that there is a God. The person he has in mind may, on the contrary, proclaim loudly that there *is* a God, and may profess belief in Him. It is in his heart, in the inward motives that shape his life and conduct in the world, that he denies Him. Whatever he may *say* about there being a God, he lives and acts as if no God existed. In the real story of his life God is at best but 'a marginal reference.' There is no place for Him in the actual unfolding of the tale.

Let us consider, then, some kinds of fool, answering to the Psalmist's meaning. And first, and worst, there is the type who is at the same time a knave. We do not have to look far in this present time for an illustration of this particular species. He is the man, or some would say the monster, who has been most in the world's mind

in these recent years. He does not declare with his lips that there is no God. Nay, he drags the name of the Deity into all his public utterances. But in his heart he has said 'there is no God.' His cruel and devilish schemes are the evidence of it. He shapes his plans and policies, indeed, as if he himself were God, judge of all others and accountable to no one.

There are many names for him, accurate and appropriate. And no doubt men will keep on finding new ones. But I doubt if any name is more appropriate than this one of the Psalmist, when he says of such an one that he is a fool. For this is plainly, even to the man with half an eye, a moral universe, and for any one to imagine that he can break the moral laws which order and govern it, and get away with it, is just the supreme height of all folly. No one can do that, any more than he can break the physical laws which govern the world and get away with it. To think anything else is simply madness. There is a graphic saying in the Book of Judges about a shadowy character called Sisera. We read that 'the stars in their courses fought against Sisera.' In other words, he had really no chance; he was up against the whole order of the universe. And that is the folly of every one whose heart is set to do evil, who says in his heart that 'there is no God.' He is in truth breaking his head against the universe. And according to the measure of his denial of God, so inevitably is his fate.

This truth stands immovable and unassailable through the whole range of human life. Wrongdoing, on whatever scale, is essentially folly and stupidity. In the very nature of things it can never succeed. It may often seem to do so, as far as we can see. But that is because we can at best see so little. When we do what is wrong we are challenging Almighty God, are saying in our hearts 'there is no God.' Can we seriously think for a moment that we can get away with it? It is the traditional folly of the ostrich to bury its head in the sand to escape from its pursuers. But that is as nothing as compared to our folly, when we imagine we can break a moral law of God, and hide ourselves from Him, and escape the consequences of our sins. There is no escape, none at all, except by way of the Divine forgiveness, and that door is not opened to us by any repetition of words, but only by an inward change and repentance of heart. No more in the moral realm than in the physical can we reap other than what we have sown!

But there is another type of fool than the deliberate wrongdoer, a far more common type, though less conspicuous amongst his fellows. There is the worldly minded type—the person who tries to run his life as if he were the master of things, in full control of circumstances, and with the power to provide against all contingencies. Neither is it characteristic of him to say 'there is no God.' Indeed, it is not at all unlikely that he goes to church on Sunday to attend the public worship of God. But in his heart he denies Him. In the shaping of his plans, and in the ordering of his affairs, he completely ignores the fact that God exists. He is the man who proposes, entirely forgetful of the fact that it is God who disposes. Now a striking feature of this type of fool is just that, in the eyes of the world, he often appears to be so wise. He is noted for the far-seeing way in which he seems to provide for everything. He appears to have the whole situation well in hand, to have everything 'taped.' And the people around him are inclined to envy him for his sound business ability and worldly judgment.

It was this type of person whom Jesus in His parable called a fool. The man of whom He spoke had everything worked out. 'I will pull down my barns,' he said, 'and build greater: and there will I bestow all my fruits and my goods. . . . But God said unto him, Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee.' There are many like that walking the earth to-day. But there are fewer than there were in the days before the war. It has done much to cure people of this kind of folly. It has wrecked most of our human plans, and through its wreckings some have come to learn wisdom. They now recognize, what is at all times true, that there is no knowing what a day may bring forth. They have made the discovery that in these days, as at any time, the only security to be counted on, for the present and for the future, is God.

But, finally, have we not humbly to confess that there is something of the fool in us all? For are there not times, are there not moods, when (though we never put it into words) we are really saying in our hearts that 'there is no God'? When everything seems to be going wrong, and we wonder if right will prevail, what is that but a whisper in our hearts that there is no God? And we should know how foolish we are, worrying and troubling ourselves about no end of things, when all the while God has everything perfectly in hand, and can make everything work together for our good.

I knew of a man once who insisted on carrying a heavy suitcase during a journey in the train. He would not set it down, but would tire himself out with the load. A foolish thing to do! But we are no less fools than he was, when we insist on struggling under our burdens when there is no need, when we will not slip them off, and let God carry them for us. The fact is that, in our hearts, we sometimes do not believe that there is a God at all!

Alas, what fools we mortals be! What is wrong about these present days? Many things, no doubt. But the root of what is wrong is not in any *thing* at all. The root of what is wrong is in ourselves, in our hearts, in the meagre faith we have in God. It is there that all the trouble lies. We *say* there is an all-wise and all-loving God, the Father whom Jesus revealed, but how few of us truly and consistently believe it! If we did, we would feel differently, ay, and, in many instances, look differently too. Is it not time that, in our attitude to life, to its burdens and trials and dangers, we bore witness before the world that there is indeed a God, the loving and eternal Father of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ?

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Harness.

'Take my yoke upon you. . . . For my yoke is easy . . .'—Mt $11^{29.30}$.

Everybody in Nazareth knew the carpenter's shop. Indeed, its open door disarmed suspicion. There was no trade process to be guarded as a precious secret; there was no shoddy workmanship scamped in the shadows. The worst that the critics could say of Jesus was that He was only the carpenter of Nazareth. There was no disgrace in being a craftsman. It seems very probable that old Joseph had a sign hanging over the door: 'My yokes are easy.' The farmers came to have their beasts fitted outside the little shop in Nazareth. They knew they could rely on those yokes.

When Jesus had put away the tools and left the bench where He had worked so many years He took with Him a wealth of memories. Sometimes in His words we may catch a glimpse of them. There was a day when He spoke to the crowd near Capernaum. On the hillside a team of oxen laboured. The yoke was badly made; their shoulders were chafed and the flies were merciless. As He looked at them in pity, He turned again to the crowd. They, too, like dumb oxen, struggled under a clumsy yoke. The Law, with a thousand stupid amplifications, cramped their daily life. The restrictions imposed by the Roman conquerors were irksome and humiliating. The burden of their own discontent was heavy and grievous to be borne.

Humanity has reached a similar pass to-day. Bowed beneath burdens that are the creation of its own follies, it toils in weariness and often in despair. The madness of exclusive nationalism and the lust for power bind half the world. Social injustice has crushed men through the years. War with a thousand attendant horrors has brought them to an hour when they long for deliverance. No parliament, no battlefield, however honourable, offers them the rest for which they crave. To such a world the Voice speaks, as it spoke to the men of Capernaum: 'Come unto me . . . and I will give you rest. Take my yoke . . . for my yoke is easy.' At first it sounds disconcerting. Must the burdened add one more weight to their heavy load?

'My yoke is easy,' He says, and it sounds strange to this distracted world. There is a choice of meanings in that word—easy, kindly, good to bear. That last phrase seems to give the clue we need. The yoke that is well-fitted is good to bear. The oxen draw the plough best when the yoke fits. Here, surely, is an amazing promise: 'Take my yoke—it is good to bear.' 'I will fit it to your need and your capacity, so that you shall labour without weariness, and find rest in the result of your toil.' There is a sense in which the soul needs its harness, as does the body of the beast that draws the plough.

The yoke is 'good to bear' because it 'gets things done.' One might have said, 'because it is constructive,' but there are times when the language of our common life is more convincing. The ox does not wear the yoke. It bears it for a definite purpose. The loaded cart must be moved or the heavy plough dragged through the stubborn, resisting soil.

The man who accepts the rule and leadership of Jesus will be linked to his real task, as surely as the yoke was fitted to the shoulders of the patient oxen standing outside Joseph's shop. He will learn what things are worth doing and he will gradually realize how these things are part of one great process. More than that, he will find his own character transformed, so that he sees new possibilities and sets out to attempt what before seemed impossible. Does this 'yoke' help us to get things done? To accept it is to accept the leadership of Jesus—that is, to be ruled and directed by Love. Now, in the first place, Love is constructive. There is nothing mawkish or sentimental about its creative activity.

It was not until 1907 that the Christian principle of forgiveness began to be recognized in the criminal law of our own land, but the effect of such recognition was seen almost at once. Within thirty years it had revolutionized the administration of justice. In 1935 fifty per cent. of indictable offences were able to be dealt with under the Probation Act. At the Assizes twenty-four per cent. of those bound over, and at the Quarter Sessions an even higher proportion, thirty-one per cent., were given a second chance of justifying themselves as decent, law-abiding citizens. Perhaps the most astonishing fact was that amongst juvenile offenders, under seventeen years of age, eighty-three per cent. were placed under suitable guardianship without the stigma of an official commitment. It would be impossible to estimate the value of this new method to the State, to society, and to the individual. In those few years a great war had been fought, and Europe had stumbled into a tragic aftermath. It was not a period in which one would have expected such progressive adventure. The achievement became possible because those responsible for it accepted the yoke.

In the second place, the 'yoke' helps man to see an ultimate purpose in his toil, and to realize his present possibilities. 'Take my yoke,' said Jesus, and showed men the kind of work such yoke was designed to aid. The Kingdom of God is at the centre of His life. That was the supreme purpose of man's living. To accept His yoke, consciously and, as far as may be, completely, is to identify oneself with that purpose. To take His yoke means to accept His standards and, indeed, to accept Him.

A new world order can only come through a world of new men. Personal salvation is the inevitable prelude to the saving of society. The tragedy of war has taken its toll of man's faith and of his hopes. He can scarcely believe any longer that nations could live in peace. Yet that is an essential condition of the Kingdom of God. He who accepts the 'yoke' accepts the One who

fits it to him. He may learn so to live as to make his contribution to the establishment of the peace of God on earth. It may be his task to destroy the evil that makes for war; it may be that he will have to endure the consequences of that evil. God fits the harness to his soul and it is good to bear, for it helps him to accomplish what seemed impossible, and to direct his effort to the ultimate and supreme end.

Beyond the discovery of new possibilities and the dominating purpose, he begins to find new power. Resources that he did not suspect are at his disposal. He goes to his task with confidence. His character is gradually transformed. The world still continues in its anger and despair, but he is resolved not to be soured. He has a message of hope; he has a task and he must be efficient. Most wonderful of all he begins to learn that he can do the work! The world is frightened, though it blusters; he is no longer afraid, though he has ceased to swagger. Such defence mechanism is not necessary to cover his own weakness. He has become strong in a new strength.

These things happened to a little company of obscure, despondent men and women at Pentecost. Their experience is no fantastic fiction; it has become part of the history of the world. Nor has it remained isolated. That same yoke was fitted to the personality of a wastrel in Carthage, and all the world felt the influence of the work of St. Augustine of Hippo. It was shaped to the tortured soul of a German monk, so that he became Martin Luther, proclaiming to men the priesthood of all believers. It was fitted to the stiff propriety of a little Oxford don, and he became John Wesley, one of the greatest evangelists in Christendom. Countless men and women have accepted it and have accomplished great things.

A yoke, however, is not 'single harness.' The team of oxen were yoked together to do a common task. The Master Himself gives us the picture. 'Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me,' He says, and so links us, not to one another, but to Himself. Surely this yoke is good to bear. It guarantees co-operative effort and each man's yoke-fellow is the Lord. That is the final secret of this 'easy' yoke.

Whatever doubts our little perplexed minds may have, we remember in the storm that Jesus trusted the Father without question. He was utterly certain of God's righteousness. In that dread hour in Gethsemane did He not cry out, 'Nevertheless, not as I will but as thou wilt?' He was certain, too, of God's love. 'Consider the lilies,' He said. 'If he care for them, will he forget you?' In every issue He was sure of God's sufficiency. The devil might desire the soul of Simon Peter, but he was already defeated: 'I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not.' That was enough; the Father was all-sufficient.

How, then, can a man doubt if he be yoke-fellow to the Christ? The harnessed soul shall rest in toil.[1]

[1] L. F. Church, *In the Storm*, 135.

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Consecration of the Secular Life.

'I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service. And be not conformed to this world: but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind.'—Ro $12^{1.2}$.

In his fascinating diary Benvenuto Cellini describes the excitements which attended the casting of his Perseus. Several misfortunes having been survived, it was found at the most critical point of the operation that the metals were still not liquefying rightly. 'Accordingly,' says Cellini, 'I sent for all my pewter platters, porringers, and dishes, to the number of some two hundred pieces, and had a portion of them cast, one by one, into the channels, the rest into the furnace. This expedient succeeded, . . . while I, now here, now there, gave orders, helped with my own hands, and cried aloud: "O God, Thou that by Thy immeasurable power didst arise from the dead, and in Thy glory didst ascend to heaven. . . ." Even as thus I spoke, in a moment the mould was filled, and seeing my work finished I fell upon my knees and gave thanks to God with all my heart.' This passage has been quoted as a picturesque illustration of the working alliance between a man's religion and his job which, broadly speaking, was characteristic of the mediæval period and survived far beyond it. In Cellini's case, it must be allowed, the alliance was concluded on somewhat peculiar ethical terms, for elsewhere in the diary he recounts how, having lost a case in the law courts, he had recourse to 'a great dagger,' attacked the successful plaintiff, deprived him of the use of both legs, and then, 'returning thanks to God for this and every other dispensation, I hoped I might be left awhile without worries!' Nevertheless, Cellini is a representative figure of an age in which the life of European man was deeply interfused with a sense of the divine, owed to that interfusion both coherence and dignity, owed to it above all that quality of zest which is a constant function of well-grounded faith and without which life becomes a problem and a burden.

How different is our age, the emancipated and embarrassed heir of the Renaissance and the Enlightenment, the Industrial Revolution, Applied Science, and Freudian Psychology! Listen to some of its voices. Walter Lippmann writes: 'The modern man finds it hard to believe that doing any one thing is better than doing any other thing, or, in fact, than doing nothing at all.' In a volume of essays which bears the significant title, *Modern Man in Search of a Soul*, Jung, the psychologist, writes: 'About a third of my cases are suffering from no clinically definable neurosis, but from the senselessness and emptiness of their lives. It seems to me, however, that this can well be described as the general neurosis of our time.'

Now, no man and no age of men can settle down

comfortably in a situation like that, and our age is looking for a road out of this labyrinth of futilitarianism. Think of two roads which are being explored. The first is the way of surrender to instinct. Of course, we may call it self-expression if we like, but if we look closely at the advocates of self-expressionism, it is difficult to resist the conviction that what they really mean by it is the uncriticized relief of the instinctive urges of body and mind. This principle of living is at least as old as the Garden of Eden: '. . . when the woman saw the tree was good for food, and that it was pleasant to the eyes, and a tree to be desired to make one wise, she took of the fruit thereof, and did eat, and gave also to her husband, and he did eat. . . . And Adam and his wife hid themselves from the Lord God.' It is really older than the Garden of Eden, if we are to accept evolutionary theory, for this living by instinct is the very principle of animal life; it is the pre-human principle, recourse to which on the part of men always means in principle regression, and in its full working out bestiality.

On the opposite side of the labyrinth Europe tried the way of the totalitarian State. In the last Christian analysis this is an idolatry in which, in the extremest German form of it, the Fatherland would seem to be substituted for Almighty God, the Führer for the Divine Son, and the 'indwelling German spirit' for the Holy Ghost; in which the sacred solitariness of personality is overridden, the pride of the group exalting itself over against every other group, the pride which knows no awe in the presence of the Infinite God.

We Christians believe that we know the road out of the morass of futilitarianism. It is the way of the consecration of life in all its breadths and depths to the service and the glory of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Of this way of living four things may be said.

First, the road of consecrated living is a revealed road, and not one which men construct by their own ingenuities and efforts. It is already there, built by God, like those 'good and substantial steps' which ran through the very middle of the Slough of Despond. Scripture never exhorts before it has exhibited; it never first says, Be something; it always first says, See something, lift up your eyes and behold, attend to what is there. Notice well in the text from which we started the words '. . . therefore, by the mercies of God. . . .' for these bear the weight of the first eleven chapters of Romans and the whole moral appeal of the Epistle hinges upon them. This is the argument: God has spoken, has acted, has revealed Himself; His invisible nature is clearly to be seen in what He has made from the creation of the world; His law, explicitly declared to the Jew, is written also in the heart of the Gentile; and over and above these revelations, befogged as they have been by human sin, Christ has come from God.

'*Therefore*,' says Paul, 'therefore I beseech you to present your bodies a living sacrifice. . . .'

Secondly, the road of consecrated living is really a road, a selected and bordered track which leads somewhere just because it does not wander everywhere. In other words, the life which is offered to God is governed by standards of value. '. . . an highway shall be there, and a way,' says Isaiah, 'and it shall be called, The way of holiness; the unclean shall not pass over it. . . .' '. . . a living sacrifice,' says Paul, 'holy, acceptable to God. . . .' Consecration chooses and rejects; consecration makes some things for ever impossible, and other things therefore attainable; consecration is inevitably disciplined and austere, and yet not harshly so when it derives from Christ, not without compassion and sweetness; and it is from consecration that zest and strength spring.

Again, this way of life, narrow in one sense, is broad enough to include all sorts and conditions of men, and does not need to be dramatic or grandiose in its setting in order to afford profound depths of meaning and satisfaction. 'So we, being many, are one body in Christ,' says St. Paul, and goes on to illustrate his meaning by referring to everyday actions which are open to all sorts of men. If a work or a life, however humble and obscure, be offered to the glory of God, immediately it becomes invested with immeasurable meaning and dignity.

> This is the famous stone
> That turneth all to gold;
> For that which God doth
> touch and own
> Cannot for less be told.

Finally, the road of consecrated living is a road which is not blocked by death. 'The world passeth away,' and those who are conformed to the world and its lusts must say with the Hebrew moralist, 'O death, how bitter is the remembrance of thee to a man that liveth at rest in his possessions, unto the man that hath nothing to vex him, and that hath prosperity in all things: yea, unto him that is yet able to receive meat!

The life which is consecrated to the living God can march upon death with a different step. Listen only to St. Paul. 'To me to live is Christ, and to die is gain.' 'For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.' 'O death, where is thy sting? O grave, where is thy victory? The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.'[1]

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Paradox of Human Existence.

BY THE REVEREND H. V. MARTIN, M.A., B.D., ANANTAPUR, SOUTH INDIA.

'When I looked for good, then evil came.'—Job 30^{26}.

The story of the Patriarch Job is a very fascinating one, coming down to us, as it does, out of the

[1] A. C. Craig, *University Sermons*, 134.

mists of antiquity, and dramatized for us so strikingly in the Book of Job in the Old Testament. It is not my intention to deal with the whole story now, but with this one pregnant verse in which Job expresses his bewilderment and perplexity as he comes up against the universal paradox of human existence. 'When I looked for good, then evil came.'

In those olden days it was commonly supposed that the upright, godly man would be blessed by God in all earthly things. He would enjoy good health and long years of life; his wife would be fruitful; his harvests would be abundant; and his cattle would increase beyond computation. In the language of the Psalms, 'Whatsoever he doeth shall prosper.' But Job found that life was not quite so straightforward as that. In spite of his uprightness, endless troubles came upon him; his cattle were carried off, his sheep struck by lightning, and his children killed in the collapse of the house under a desert whirlwind. To crown it all, Job himself was stricken down with a painful disease in which his whole body broke out in sores; and in the end, we see him, seated amongst the ashes, scraping himself with a potsherd, uttering this poignant complaint against existence, 'When I looked for good, evil came.'

But in its essence, Job's experience is nothing strange. All human life in its relation to God is paradoxical. The good do not always prosper, and the overthrow of the wicked often seems strangely delayed. As William Cowper expresses it:

God moves in a mysterious way
His wonders to perform.

Things do not work out just as we expect them to. Good and evil are strangely mixed up in all our life. Let us therefore look at this paradox of human existence from both sides.

Firstly, when we look for good, evil comes. That is to say, there is no good in life which is not accompanied by some corresponding evil. Every gain brings a loss; every pleasure some pain; every triumph a defeat. From our store of English proverbial sayings, we may think of many which emphasize this side of human existence. There is no rose without a thorn. The best medicine always tastes bitter. And more colloquially, What you gain on the swings, you lose on the roundabouts. In even the best of human 'goods' there is always some snag.

Take physical health, for instance. Is this pure gain? Our public school-boys are brought up on the motto, 'Mens sana in corpore sano'; but is there no evil in this good? The experience of the Christian Church down through the ages is that good physical health and true spiritual health rarely go together. The feeling of good health tends towards a feeling of self-sufficiency and self-assertion, a soil in which the finer flowers of the Christian spirit cannot grow. Sören Kierkegaard even went so far as to write, 'To lead a really spiritual life while physically and psychically healthy is altogether impossible.'

Take material prosperity again. Is increased wealth, to which so many of us look as a good to be desired, not unmixed with evil? Have not many of the world's richest men testified that in their riches, when they looked for good, evil came? Yes. Increased wealth means increased worry, fear, and anxiety, and above all, increased responsibility before God. We look to it to bring us good, but evil inevitably comes with it. The classical illustration of this is the story of King Midas of Phrygia who obtained from the gods the gift that everything he touched should turn to gold. For an hour he was supremely happy in the possession of this great 'good'; but feeling hungry, sat down to eat. Alas, however, every mouthful of food turned to gold, and at the touch of his lips, the sparkling wine turned to liquid gold. To crown it all, when he embraced his favourite daughter, she was immediately changed into a golden statue in his arms, and so he was driven to beseech the gods to take back this so terrible a gift.

So it is with all earthly 'goods' after which we strive. There is none which is unmitigatedly good; each brings with it some evil. And that is why St. Paul exhorts us, 'having food and raiment let us be therewith content.'

Now, secondly, let us reverse the picture and see the other side of the paradox of human existence. If, when we look for good, evil comes, then when evil comes, we should look for good in it. This is also true to human experience, namely, that every evil may bring with it some good, every pain some pleasure, every defeat a triumph. Our English proverbs again stress this side of human existence. We say, It is an ill wind which blows no one any good. Every dark cloud has a silver lining. And, it is easy passing milestones when you are going home. When we look for good, then evil comes. But let us not be in despair; for out of that evil, out of the sorrows and sufferings and losses of life, by the grace of God, unexpected blessings may come to us, and through us to others.

On the shores of the Adriatic Sea there stands a wonderful city of marble palaces and blue lagoons, the city of Venice, world-renowned for its striking beauty, and of which the Italians say, See Venice and die. But how did such a city of beauty arise? It arose out of the terrible invasion of Italy by Attila and his Huns, who ravaged the fair cities, massacring the men and carrying off the women and children to slavery and worse. Fleeing before the cruelty and savagery of these Huns, a small group of Italians took refuge upon a few sandbanks off the shore, and there in A.D. 452 a small settlement was founded which in the course of time developed into that wonderful city of blue lagoons. Out of the evil of the invasion of the Huns, there has come down to posterity the indescribable beauty of Venice.

Here in India, we have another standing monument of how good can come out of evil. Hundreds of years ago, in North India, Shah Jehan, the Mogul Emperor lived on the banks of the Jumna river with his favourite wife, Muntaz Mahal. Between them there was a remarkable bond of

affection; but, alas, one day she suddenly took ill and died. He was disconsolate, stricken in despair, at this stroke of fate. But, born of the anguish of his heart, there came the idea of a palace tomb, worthy of their erstwhile love; and so to-day there stands on the banks of the Jumna river, reflected in its cool, placid waters, that marvel of white marble, that gem of Indian architecture, which travellers come from the ends of the earth to see, the glorious Taj Mahal. Out of the evil which came upon Shah Jehan was born a thing of beauty and a joy for ever.

In the same way in our lives, by God's grace, good may be wrought out of evil. Is it not through the unspeakable tragedy of the Crucifixion, that unutterable evil of the Cross of Jesus, that there has been wrought the inestimable good of the world's redemption? That is the paradox of human existence. No gain without loss; but no loss that cannot become gain.

The ugly spider spins a lovely web.
Flaming nasturtiums grow from dusty ground.
Across dark clouds the rainbow's lovely light
Shows that in darkness loveliest things abound.

The ugly root brings forth the radiant flower.
The blackest night shows small stars glimmering bright.
From beds of pain come courage, strength and power
And from the suffering life comes inward light.

So maybe, grown from this world's agony
From our bewilderment in senseless pain
Flowers of the spirit, burgeoning from sorrow
Will, in Christ's mercy, light the world again.

Contributions and Comments.

Did Jesus Foresee His Passion?

1. THERE is, of course, only one answer to the question 'Did Jesus foresee His Passion?' The Synoptics make it clear that He not only foresaw it but that He foretold the Passion to the disciples; first in the plainest language and subsequently with some precision. If it were the case that the later passages reflect knowledge after the event on the part of the writers, there can be no question that Jesus anticipated clearly what would be the end of His journey.

2. All the disclosures of our Lord about His death occur in the Gospels after the incident at Cesarea Philippi, if we except the vague hint in Mk 2^{20}—'The days will come, when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them.' There is no need to question that this may well have been the case. It has, however, become customary to suppose that *it was at this period of the ministry that Jesus Himself became aware* that the sacrifice of His life was to be His ultimate destiny. Thus, to illustrate this view, Dr. C. J. Cadoux says (THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, Feb., 1942): 'Jesus' mission was world-wide and eternal in its significance. But its actual features were shaped by the historical and local situation in which He found Himself. That speciality should help us to see that, at the beginning of His ministry, He expected, not repudiation and death, but acceptance and loyalty from His people, and that He interested Himself deeply in the possibility of a reconciliation between Israel and the Gentile world.' So also Dr. W. P. Paterson (*D.B.*, one-vol., 447), writing on the Temptation: 'But this He put aside as impious, and cast upon the Father the care of making His path plain, while He awaited, prudently as well as bravely, the gradual disclosure of His call to work and danger.' It is this view that I wish now to question.

3. It is obviously difficult to estimate what was in Jesus' mind in the days before Cesarea Philippi, and any attempt must of necessity be chargeable as arbitrary. But if we are to attempt any estimate, it is surely misguided to confine ourselves to the Synoptic data of the pre-Cesarea Philippi period. We cannot so completely dissociate the glorified Christ and the historic Jesus as not to allow something to the tremendous effect which the personality of our Lord made upon those who knew Him. Nor can we altogether ignore the fact that in the faith of the Early Church the mission of Jesus was *consummated* by His death and glorification. For Jesus, then, to have undertaken such a mission and not to have known from the beginning what the end would be seems incredible.

4. The view that is being criticised alleges that at the Cesarea Philippi period Jesus became aware of the failure of His mission to the nation—His call for national repentance had produced no response, His appeal to be accepted as Messiah had fallen on deaf ears, His attempt to reform the religion had not succeeded, His announcement of the Kingdom had been rejected—and that He turned from the nation a disappointed and disillusioned man, determined to undertake the Cross; and thereupon began to prepare His disciples for the shock of His death and to train them for the work they were to do after His departure. This view, so far as it professes to tell what was in the Lord's own mind and intention, divides the whole ministry as by a knife-cut. Before Cesarea Philippi He is to be regarded as one sort of Saviour; after, as another. The division is not healed by saying that 'from the beginning of the ministry Jesus possessed the Messianic consciousness'; for to possess the Messianic consciousness and not to know (if the New Testament is to be trusted and the Christian

gospel to remain unimpaired) what was Messiah's truest and most urgent mission is scarcely believable. That Christ 'died for our sins and was raised for our justification' is surely not a mere discovery of Paul: if it is the intention of God, representing God's final act to save the world, it is not to be supposed that from the moment Jesus began His ministry He was ignorant of it. In this connexion, incidentally, when Dr. Cadoux (*op. cit.*) says: 'It is not for us to say *a priori* how much human limitation is compatible with Jesus' Divine Saviourhood; that is exactly what we have to allow the records as they stand to teach us,' it is to be hoped that in approaching the records we do so with the conviction that we are dealing with an incomparable and unique personality; that is to say, one who has achieved for us the character of 'Divine Saviour.' In any case, it is impossible to believe that the gospel was born in the heart of a disappointed and disillusioned man.

5. The view that Jesus knew the end of the journey from its beginning is independent, of course, of Synoptic tradition, or of Synoptic chronology: it does not preclude the supposition that the Cesarea Philippi incident is a 'watershed' in the tradition, nor the supposition that Jesus, knowing that the sacrifice of Himself was the end towards which He moved, chose not to disclose it to the disciples until they had discovered that He was the Christ. And here it may be pointed out that while Jesus might naturally expect that the disciples would in due time 'draw the right inference, without prompting, about His dignity,' it would not be so natural to expect them to draw the right inference about the *manner* of His fulfilling the mission appointed Him by the Father—here they did need prompting, and the prompting might well have begun after Cesarea Philippi. But it does not follow that Jesus was Himself ignorant of the fact up to that period of His ministry.

6. Any Christology must be based on the fact that Jesus was a man of His own time. But it is also necessary to give to Him a larger degree of prescience and understanding than the view we are criticising would seem to do. Some presentations of our Lord would almost suggest the religious tyro! It is to be remembered that, as we suppose, Jesus was in the thirties when His ministry began. If the story of the visit to the Temple at the age of twelve is anything to go by, it is permissible to believe that the intervening years were spent in arduous study of the O.T. scriptures (for which there is much warrant), in deep meditation, in much prayer, and in acute observation; that, in fact, when He left His home at Nazareth His spiritual and intellectual development was complete, so far, at any rate, as His great mission to mankind was concerned; and that He perceived what the course of that mission would be in its essential outline. If at the Baptism Jesus received overpowering conviction that He was Messiah, is it credible that He was not to know what Messiah was to do until (shall we say) half His course was accomplished? When at the Temptation He rejected other than the Father's way of doing in the world what was appointed Him, is it possible to believe that He did not there and then know what it was that the Father had appointed Him to do? If, as seems apparent from the records, He gave Himself from the beginning to the work of preaching, even more than to the work of healing, what was the content of that preaching? We know that it marked Him as 'having authority,' that it laid Him open to the charge of blasphemy, that it provoked the most virulent opposition and endangered His life—and we know that He knew the fate of all the prophets who went before Him, including His contemporary, the Baptist. Is it likely, therefore, that He began this almost deliberately provocative ministry without knowing what His own fate would be? Was He so blissfully optimistic that He expected the whole nation to receive Him and acclaim Him Messiah; and must we see Him 'setting His face to go to Jerusalem' as a disappointed man determined on the last desperate act to save His people? If we are to be committed to the view that Jesus from the very start of His mission did not know what He was doing, we lay ourselves open to the pernicious notion of the simple Galilean peasant-prophet, and that picture will not fit the stature of our Lord.

7. The reply that may be made to the view that Jesus knew the end from the beginning, that He anticipated defeat and death and accepted it as the Father's will for Him and the Father's way of salvation from the start of His ministry, is that it reduces the earlier ministry of our Lord to some futility or unreality. Would He, it may be said, call the nation to repent if He expected no response? Why the cry over Jerusalem in the last days if His hopes had not been disappointed? But Jesus would have been less than sincere if He had not preached the truth without regard to its acceptance or rejection by the nation. What burned in His soul had to be told. He was surely not less than all the prophets in this. Indeed, with all the precedents of the prophets' rejection before Him, we do Him some discredit if we suppose that in the high hour when He 'came into Galilee preaching the gospel of the kingdom' He had not already calculated His own repudiation and death. Though 'His own' did not receive Him, that earlier preaching was not lost, was neither unreal nor futile. It became valid and authentic for all mankind and for ever the moment the disciples knew He was risen from the dead. And I suggest that Jesus knew this, too, from the moment He began the great enterprise. And not as to His word only, but also Himself as the Saviour of the world who should achieve the glorious work by His own death on the Cross. This view of the matter, it seems to me, alone does justice to the person and work of our Lord, and yet leaves Him not less human and not less understandable. If we seek reasons for His reticence about the Cross before Cesarea Philippi, we should look for them in the disciples, and not in the Lord Himself.

WILLIAM H. BAKER.

Wakefield, Yorks.

Entre Nous.

William Charter Piggott.

A memorial volume for the Rev. W. C. Piggott has been edited anonymously and published under the title *William Charter Piggott*, 1872–1943 (Independent Press; 5s. net). There is no biography and very little information about his work. He was chairman of the Congregational Union in 1931, a director of the London Missionary Society, and minister of the Bunyan Meeting House, of Whitefield's Central Mission and at Streatham successively. By the testimony of many friends he was a man of brilliant gifts and of rare character. But these facts are gathered incidentally. The memorial book is not intended to be biographical. It is meant to allow Mr. Piggott to reveal himself, and the chapters are all headed: 'He speaks,' followed by 'In the Sermon, in Prayer, in Praise, as Servant of Youth, to the children, as counsellor for his denomination,' and so on. He always prepared a précis of the Sunday's sermon as a heading for the next Sunday's service paper, and from hundreds of these we have here selections that reveal Mr. Piggott's mind about many things. There are also numerous examples of his verse, secular and sacred. From this material we have chosen a few extracts which are of special interest.

The Secret of Paul.

'The real clue to all the labours of Paul is not to be found in his argument but in his doxologies, his outbursts of pure wonder at the grace of God or of almost heartbreaking glory in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ: "Oh, the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and of the knowledge of God! How unsearchable are His judgments and His ways past tracing out."'

The Silent Press.

'Every nation has better things than its revealed surfaces suggest. Our newspapers do not reveal England. I suppose they cannot. The things that are right and wholesome are not news. The papers tell us and our national neighbours of the people who have quarrelled, who have been unfaithful, dishonest, who have got into prison. But they do not tell us of the multitude who have gone quietly about their work, who have been friendly, peaceful, and kind. This England of ours could not endure if it were not better than its published expressions. And is that not true of every land in Europe?—that there is in them all a wealth of kindly, lovable, friendly people. . . . There is in this the material for good and understanding and friendship, and for a great further advance towards a more truly civilized, law-abiding, and peaceful world.'

Common Sense Religion.

'Christ's appeal religiously was to the common sense of men, and that means not to a lower or vulgar mind but to the sense that is common to all of us. He asks us to use our mind in religion as we do in ordinary things, to think honestly and shrewdly about other matters besides weather and markets. He was far more afraid that men should think too little than that they should think too much. His crucifixion was not only the great tragedy of history, it was the supremely senseless and irrational act of men. It was not only a crime, but a dull and unintelligent crime. He had appealed to the minds and hearts of men, and their narrowing thoughts had condemned Him. He continues to appeal to the minds and hearts of men, and their widening thoughts must accept Him. The claim is that Christ is the goal of all clear thinking, that common sense leads to Him.'

The Strength of the Hills is His also.

My Lord is on the hills of Galilee,
A boy at play;
The sun smiles on Him, and the upland breeze,
Sportive and gay,
Makes mischief in His curls: flowers tiptoe up
To catch His smile,
And all the singing birds with raptured trills
His ear beguile.

My Lord is on the hills, the silent hills,
A man at prayer:
Night folds Him closely in her guardian cloak,
And the still air
Lets the compassionate and tender stars
Draw near and near,
While all creation muffles down her groan
His plea to hear.

My Lord is on the hill of Calvary,
A man divine,
Who, lifted up on a crabbed tree unkind,
By that same sign
Makes it the highest hill in the wide world,
All kingdoms shown
From its great summit, and by conquering pain
Claimed for His own.

F. J. Rae.

Orde Wingate.

'Colonel George Wingate, Orde's father, "served in seven frontier campaigns in India, and was the founder of the Central Asian Mission for evangelization and medical work among the Pathans." When he died in 1936, *The Times* described him as "one of the last survivors of a generation of soldiers which united the service of the State with that of the Christian faith." They counted without his son. . . .

'Orde Wingate was born on 26th February 1903, the third child, and the eldest boy—there were three sons and four daughters. They received a careful, even expensive, education—seven, on the pay of a retired colonel. "We were brought up," the eldest said to me, "on 'the Scots régime of porridge, bread and dripping, and the sincere milk of the word.'" Strict discipline, frugality, and hard work. Orde grew up physically very tough, and spiritually a rebel; and yet he assumed the full inheritance of his family. He was a Protestant, a Dissenter, a Puritan to the depths of his soul; a searcher after the inner light; a man with a tortured conscience, and with the certainties of a believer. He was an individualist, a lonely man who, in things big and small, showed a preference for what he could do on his own—for instance, for swimming, shooting, and riding, as against organized team-games. . . .

'His daring was of a rare quality: it was not the courage of one who did not see the danger, nor was it based on the intoxication which team-spirit and mass action are apt to produce. But he was hard, had an indomitable will, high standards of honour, and the completest disregard for his own safety or interest. . . . A Zionist friend once asked him: "Tell me, Orde, when you call one man 'good' and another 'bad,' what exactly do you mean?" Orde looked astonished: "Why, of course, I use the words in their Biblical sense: when I say a man is 'good,' I mean he is one who lives to fulfil the purposes of God; when I say he is 'bad,' I mean he lives to frustrate the purposes of God."'[1]

Psalm lxxiii. 25.

The classic translation of Luther in Ps 73[25] gives expression to this living faith and certainty in the reality of God and His directing will: 'If I have but Thee, then I care not about anything else in heaven and earth,' *i.e.*, in the whole universe. It seems clear that Luther meant by *nachfragen* 'to take interest in,' 'to care for.' Luther ignored the parallelism of the verse, but he rendered the very soul of the Psalmist's mighty conviction in words cited by many modern Hebraists. Form must not always blind us to the real meaning intended. His translation carries a ringing challenge and a daring leap of faith. No Christian even can excel the heights of certainty attained here by the Psalmist in those words so marvellously rendered: 'If I have but Thee'—nothing else matters in the whole universe.[2]

[1] L. B. Namier, 'Orde Wingate,' in *Time and Tide*, April 22, 1944.

The Other Fellow.

'On that unforgettable Sunday during the Battle of Britain when 187 enemy planes were shot down, I had just finished a task in the heart of London,' writes Dr. Leslie F. Church, President of the Methodist Church, in the *Star*. 'No one was allowed to leave the building where I was. I lay on a floor where 250 people, coming off duty, were sheltering. Next to me was a little lift-boy—fourteen, not more. He tried to read and so did I. The noise was deafening. Bombs and shells seemed to me to be louder than the barrage I remembered on the Somme.

'Suddenly a small voice said: "Wouldn't yer git orf ter sleep a bit better if I was to tike orf yer boots, mister?" I shall never forget his elfin face as he looked at me, thinking of my comfort when most of us were thinking of our particular chance of escaping alive! Good manners? Yes; honest-to-goodness religion, fundamental Christianity, thought of the other fellow—the foundation of a new world. . . .

'If we are to build this brave new world out of the scorched salvage and scorched souls that will be left we shall need all the courage and courtesy and generosity of which we are capable.'[3]

Canon A. C. Deane.

The Editors wish to apologize for an error which was made in a review of Canon Deane's *The World Christ Knew* in last month's EXPOSITORY TIMES—the term 'late' being used. This occurred through a notice in one of the weeklies of the death of Canon Deane. This notice proved fortunately to be incorrect, and the distress caused to Canon Deane's many friends is much regretted. Canon Deane has dealt very kindly and lightly with the matter, asking us only to assure readers that he is still very much alive. He writes, 'May I ask why in an otherwise amiable review of my latest—and, as I trust, not last—book in your current number I am described as "the late Canon A. C. Deane"? I beg to assure you that I am neither deceased nor habitually unpunctual.'

[2] J. Vernon Lewis, *The Word of God in Theory and Experience*, 10.

[3] *Public Opinion*, May 5, 1944.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.